

RESEARCH BULLETIN

DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION FOR WHITES AND BLACKS:

THE TOLEDO STUDY

Lawrence J. Stricker

This Bulletin is a draft for interoffice circulation. Corrections and suggestions for revision are solicited. The Bulletin should not be cited as a reference without the specific permission of the author. It is automatically superseded upon formal publication of the material.

Educational Testing Service

Princeton, New Jersey

November 1976

Lawrence J. Stricker

Abstract

The aims of this study were (a) to determine the major dimensions of social stratification for whites as well as blacks and (b) to explore the existence of distinct social classes. A survey was conducted with 225 white and 206 black household heads in Toledo, Ohio, using a highly structured interview that included variables reflecting major theoretical dimensions of stratification, important indexes, and well established correlates. Eighteen first-order factors were found for whites and 19 for blacks. Five factors matched in the two samples: social status, residence, organization activity, political activity and efficacy, and main support's social status. Other important factors, unique to each sample, were: for whites, self-employed and majority group membership, and for blacks, class consciousness and method variance. The indexes, except for Own Education, did not consistently load the factors that they presumably tap. Second- and third-order factors were also obtained, but they were difficult to interpret. Two separate cluster analyses of individuals, based on their score profiles on social status variables, identified 37 and 47 clusters of white respondents, the largest cluster containing 13 people. (The cluster analyses were not done for blacks.) All in all, the present findings indicate that stratification is more complex than anticipated by current conceptualizations, previous research, and existing indexes. These results also point up the need for revising the theoretical formulations and using more appropriate measures of the salient dimensions.

Social stratification has been an extraordinarily active area, both theoretically and empirically, in sociology since the 1930's. This interest has been shared in large measure with psychology, stimulated by the wide range of links observed between psychological and stratification variables.

Despite this activity, however, some fundamental questions still remain unanswered. One involves the dimensionality of stratification. Many conceptualizations of the underlying dimensions have been advanced. Univariante views include, among others, economic position (Marx, 1967; Marx & Engels, 1932), class consciousness (Centers, 1949), and social status (Warner & Lunt, 1941; Warner, Meeker, & Eells, 1949). And multivariate schemes range from sustenance and comfort, humor and diversion, and self-respect and ego expansion (Davis & Moore, 1945; Moore, 1963); to status, economic position, and power (Weber, 1946, 1947). Empirically, though, this field has focused predominantly on status, largely neglecting the other postulated dimensions. Concern with status is seen in most research efforts, such as Warner's (Warner & Low, 1947; Warner & Lunt, 1941, 1942; Warner & Srole, 1945) classic study of Yankee City, as well as in the majority of commonly used indexes of stratification, many of which grew out of these investigations (Gordon, 1958).

Several factor analyses (Artz, Curtis, Fairbank, & Jackson, 1971; Atherton, 1962; Kahl & Davis, 1955; Knupfer, 1946) are consistent with a multidimensional conception of stratification, even though these

studies were limited to existing indexes and related variables predominantly reflecting social status, thereby restricting the scope of the factors obtained. Although all of the investigations, except the Knupfer study in which the pertinent data are unreported, found a large general factor (prior to rotation), one or more other factors were also identified. Atherton, Kahl and Davis, and Knupfer found two; and Artz et al., analyzing six communities, uncovered five in each. Two factors were found in all four studies: (a) one defined by the respondent's occupation as well as education, and, sometimes, friends' occupation; and (b) another by variables concerning his or her home and neighborhood and, occasionally, family income. Artz et al. found several additional factors, one defined by family income, another by the occupation and education of the respondent's parents, a third by his father-in-law's occupation and wife's education, and a fourth by majority group membership (essentially white vs. black and Chicano). These investigators also identified two second-order factors, which differed in composition from community to community.

Another unresolved question stems from the circumstance that most of the substantive research and index development has been done with whites. Hence it is uncertain whether this work is relevant to blacks and other races. Applicability to blacks is a particularly important concern because of their number and the amount of research using stratification indexes that is carried out with them.

Comparatively little theoretical speculation and empirical research exists about black social structure and its correspondence with white's. A notable theoretical contribution is the conception of the two races as forming separate castes, each with its own social structure (Park, 1928; Warner, 1936). Several commentators (Drake, 1965; Smith, 1970) have suggested that the two structures possess different shapes, reflecting variations in the size of the various social classes: the white's structure is shaped like a diamond, the middle classes being largest; and the black's is a pyramid, with the lower classes being greatest. This view is consistent with the observed frequency distributions of social stratification indexes for whites and blacks in the same community or the country at large (Gilmore & Wilson, 1945; Hill & McCall, 1950; Nam & Powers, 1965; Schmid & Nobbe, 1965; Segal & Schaffner, 1968). The white distributions are essentially normal, with some concentration of individuals at the top of the scale; the black are highly skewed, with large numbers of people at the bottom. These race differences are greatest in rural areas and small communities. Analysts (Drake, 1965; Mayer & Buckley, 1970) have also argued, largely on impressionistic grounds, that the social classes in the two races are not equivalent (e.g., the white middle classes correspond to the black upper classes).

In light of such possible differences between the two social structures, the applicability to blacks of standard indexes of stratification has been questioned (Canady, 1943; Murray, 1951; Pettigrew, 1964; Price, 1934). The findings on this issue are contradictory.

The measures' relationships with criterion variables are usually similar, with a few important exceptions, for the two races (Beck, 1967; Bloom, Whiteman, & Deutsch, 1965). However, the indexes generally differ in their intercorrelations for whites and blacks, the relationships typically being higher for the former (Anderson, 1955; Blum, 1972; Coleman, Blum, Sorenson, & Rossi, 1972; Duncan, 1969; Goyder & Pineo, 1974; Jackman & Jackman, 1973; Turner, 1953).

A third important issue centers around the reality of social classes, a class being defined broadly here as an aggregation of people at roughly the same level of a social hierarchy (Jackson & Curtis, 1968). The question of whether classes are distinct and qualitatively different from each other or merely represent arbitrary divisions of an underlying continuum has stimulated a lengthy controversy in sociology since Warner's (Warner & Lunt, 1941) claim that he uncovered real classes in Yankee City.

The research on this topic, mainly based on whites and usually involving the class structure of a particular community, has taken several forms, and the various kinds of results are inconsistent with each other. On the one hand, (a) judges generally disagree about the number of classes present (Hollingshead, 1949; Kaufman, 1945; Lasswell, 1954; Lenski, 1952; Rennie & Hilgendorf, 1960; Wheeler, 1949) and (b) no gaps are observable in the distributions of stratification indexes (Hetzler, 1953; Kenkel cited in Cuber & Kenkel, 1954). On the other hand, (a) divisions occur on a stratification index, corresponding to clusters of people differing in their use of communication media (Hollingshead & Redlich, 1958);

(b) discontinuities exist in regressions of social participation variables on a stratification index (Duncan & Artis, 1951) and in regressions of stratification indexes on each other (Landecker, 1960), the breaks separating clerical workers from manual workers and farmers in the former study and differentiating the top 6% or 7% of the population from the remainder in the latter investigation; (c) boundaries appear in both intergeneration and intrageneration movement among occupational groupings, dividing clerical and manual workers, and sometimes farmers (Blau, 1965; Blau & Duncan, 1967; Jaffe & Carleton, 1954; Lipset & Bendix, 1959); and (d) clusters generally occur in people's patterns of associations with each other, the groupings, which consist of individuals at the same level on a stratification index, typically differentiating those at the extremes (Curtis, 1963; Duncan & Artis, 1951; Kenkel cited in Cuber & Kenkel, 1954; King, 1961; Laumann, 1966, 1973; Laumann & Guttman, 1966; Loomis, Beegle, & Longmore, 1947; Lundberg & Steele, 1938).

The principal aim of the present study was to determine the major dimensions of social stratification for whites and blacks in a large Northern city by factor analyses of a comprehensive set of potentially important variables drawn from the relevant theoretical and empirical literature. The focus was on a large city because of the importance of communities of this size and on a Northern one because the effects on blacks of segregation and discrimination are apt to be less severe in that section of the country. Secondary goals were (a) to

assess the correspondence between these dimensions and leading conceptualizations of stratification, (b) to compare the dimensions for the two races; and (c) to identify the best measure of each dimension. An additional purpose was to explore, in a preliminary way, the existence of distinct social classes by attempting to identify homogeneous sets of whites on the basis of cluster analyses of individuals, employing their profiles of scores on the social status dimension. Each of these clusters of people would presumably represent a class. This effort, in view of its exploratory nature, was restricted to status and to whites, because the preponderance of findings on the class issue concern social status in white samples.

Method

Sampling Procedure

The field work, by Opinion Research Corporation, was carried out during 1967-1968 in Lucas County, Ohio, which represented the Toledo Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) at the time of the 1960 Census. (The Toledo SMSA was subsequently enlarged in 1963 to include Wood County, Ohio, and Monroe County, Michigan, U. S. Bureau of the Budget, 1964.) This community was chosen because it seemed to be reasonably representative of large Northern cities. Its selection was based on Hadden and Borgatta's (1965) factor analysis of 65 variables, mainly drawn from the 1960 census, for 644 communities with populations of 25,000 or more. These investigators identified 8 major factors involving social characteristics and listed scores for each community

on 12 variables defining these factors. For the present research, the 12 were used in separate analyses of two sets of cities with populations of at least 250,000: 24 Northern as well as 33 Northern and Western. (The regions were defined the same way as in the census, U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1961a.) Both analyses involved calculating for every community the absolute deviation of each of its scores on the variables from the corresponding mean for the set of cities, and then summing the city's deviations to obtain an overall measure. Toledo had the smallest overall deviation in each analysis.

The 1960 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962a, Tables 111 and 112) distributions of education and current occupation of the white and nonwhite family heads in the Toledo SMSA, both variables scaled, as far as possible, in accordance with the procedures employed by Warner et al. (1949), were inspected for the purpose of obtaining some assurance that a reasonable number of respondents were available at each level of social status. The distributions appear in Tables 1 and 2. In addition, Toledo and Lucas County were visited in order to establish that no unusual circumstances existed, not reflected in the census data, which would make this community atypical.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

Although the reanalysis of the Hadden and Borgatta data was based on cities rather than SMSAs, the Toledo SMSA was chosen for investigation, because the statistical unit should better represent the natural

community, which may not necessarily correspond to the city's legal boundaries. An SMSA, by definition, is "...an integrated economic and social unit with a recognized large population nucleus" (U. S. Bureau of the Budget, 1964, p. iv). The 1960 definition of the Toledo SMSA as comprising only Lucas County was adopted rather than the subsequent and broader version, because (a) Lucas County, since it consists largely of Toledo, has greater similarity than the three-county unit to the city, making the Hadden and Borgatta data more applicable; and (b) the field work could be more readily carried out in a single county, particularly in view of the relatively small samples required.

The Toledo SMSA consists of the city, several suburban communities, and rural areas (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b). The SMSA population (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b, Table P-1; 1972, Table P-1) was 456,931 in 1960, including 318,003 in Toledo, and 484,370 in 1970, with 383,818 in the city. The percentage of blacks in the SMSA and the city was 9.4% and 12.6%, respectively, in 1960, and 11.3% and 13.8% in 1970.

Separate multistage area probability samples were drawn of white and black households.² The census tracts in Lucas County were stratified by geographic location (Toledo vs. remainder of county), race (67% or more whites vs. all other tracts), and median family income, using race and income data from the 1960 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b, Table P-1). The census tracts were then divided into area segments. These segments were generally blocks in Toledo and census enumeration districts elsewhere, but blocks or districts with fewer than 18 house-

holds were combined with geographically contiguous ones, and districts with 50 or more homes were divided so that they contained approximately 30 each. The final set of segments comprised 1,469 zones of 100 households each (Deming, 1956). One segment was randomly selected from each zone with probability proportional to size.

These segments were then classified as white or not all white, using the census data, local informants, and field visits, in order to facilitate oversampling of blacks. Three sets of these segments were randomly selected: (a) 132 all white, representing 1/9 of those originally designated plus others added because of new construction that took place after the 1960 census; (b) an additional 132 all white, having the same composition as the basic set of 132 segments; and (c) 236 not all white, corresponding to 3/4 of the original segments together with those added for new construction.

All of the households in the basic all white and the not all white segments were listed, and 18 randomly selected homes in each segment were classified by race of occupant and rated with Warner et al.'s (1949) house type scale. Each segment was also rated with Warner et al.'s dwelling area scale. Listing, classification, and rating were only carried out in each of the additional all white segments if one or more households in it were black.

Subsequently, for the white sample, the classified households occupied by whites were randomly selected for interview, using the following rates: 1/9 of these homes in the basic set of all white

segments and 1/60 of these in the not all white segments. As a result, the white sampling fraction was 1/450 overall as well as in the sets of all white and not all white segments. For the black sample, the classified households occupied by blacks or those whose race was undetermined were selected, using these rates: 4/7 of these homes in both sets of all white segments and 1/6 of these in the not all white segments. Consequently, the black sampling fraction was 1/45 overall and in the two sets of segments.

Minor adjustments were made in the samples during the field work. All households from the white sample found to be headed by blacks were added to the black sample, a fraction--corresponding to the white sampling rate--of households from the black sample that had white heads were added to the white sample, and all homes in either sample with Oriental and other nonwhite heads were dropped entirely. Corrections were also made for errors in the listing, missed households being added to the samples as appropriate.

Field Procedures

The interviewing took place between October, 1967 and September, 1968. Twenty white and 23 black interviewers participated. They were recruited locally from newspaper advertisements, the state employment service, community organizations, and a local interviewing agency. The characteristics of the two sets of interviewers are reported in Tables 3 and 4. Fifteen of the 20 whites and 19 of the 23 blacks were women, their median age was 27.0 and 31.6, and their median years of education was 13.4 and 12.4.

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

Prospective interviewers participated in a three-hour training session during which the background of the study was outlined, general interviewing procedures were described, and the questionnaire was discussed in detail, followed by supervised practice in reading questions from the questionnaire, recording answers, and making ratings. A 26-page Interviewer Specifications manual, covering this same material more extensively, was also provided. They then studied the manual and questionnaire at home and completed a practice interview with an acquaintance. Subsequently, this interview was reviewed by a supervisor, and the candidate took a 22-item test based on the manual. Those individuals who had acceptable practice interviews and test scores were selected and assigned to work.

Throughout the course of the study, whenever an interviewer completed an assignment, typically consisting of five to ten households, a sample of his or her work, including completed questionnaires and records of unsuccessful contacts, was reviewed by a supervisor and discussed with the interviewer. All of the questionnaires were subsequently read by a supervisor, and those with a substantial amount of missing or inadequate information were returned--usually to the original interviewers--for correction, following additional contacts with the households.³ Interviewers also received memoranda describing general problems that occurred in the field work.

Interviews were conducted with heads of household, whether they were male or female. In general, the head was considered to be the household member named as such by the person in the home with whom the interviewer initially spoke, but if a husband and wife or an unrelated man and woman (unless the man was clearly a roomer) lived there, he was designated. Interviewers were assigned to respondents of the same race. Prior to the interviewer's initial contact, a letter was sent to the home describing the interview and requesting cooperation. A copy appears in the appendix. Those who refused to be interviewed or who were not at home after several visits were sent a second letter stressing the importance of the study, and additional attempts were made to complete interviews with them, usually after their reassignment to different interviewers. A copy of this letter appears in the appendix. Reassignments were made of 90 (29.8%) of the households designated, after deletions, for the white sample and 64 (17.8%) of those for the black sample.

An attempt was made to establish that every completed interview had been carried out in the prescribed manner with the correct respondent. This validation was conducted by telephone wherever possible; households without telephones were visited. Several questions were asked for comparison with the information on the questionnaire. Three were used with every respondent: (a) About how long did the interview last? (corresponding to Cover Page: Time Interview Began/Time Interview Ended), (b) Where were you born? (identical to Q. 65), and (c) How many years have you lived in the Toledo area? (identical to Q. 68). And an additional

question, usually concerning occupation, was selected individually for each person. In instances where the answers to any of these questions appeared to be inconsistent with the questionnaire, others were asked and additional information was obtained.

The validation uncovered two kinds of irregularities in the work of three interviewers: (a) someone other than the household head was interviewed; or (b) the contact had been made with the correct person, but the interview had not been completed in its entirety. These interviewers were dismissed, and all of their work--unsuccessful interview contacts and completed interviews--was discarded. In 36 of the 40 sample segments in which these interviewers had been given assignments, the 91 households involved were replaced, using the same procedures employed in the initial sample selection. In the four remaining segments the number of homes needed as replacements exceeded those available for assignment. As a result, the 13 original households were retained, and an attempt was made to interview them anew.

In all, it was possible to verify 222 (98.7%) of the white and 195 (94.7%) of the black interviews that were used in the study; the remainder could not be evaluated because the respondents had moved.

Another problem involved the failure of one or two interviewers, who left the study, to return assignment cards for households where no interviews were completed. Consequently, it was uncertain whether the homes had been approached. The ten affected households in seven segments were replaced, using the same sampling procedures that were employed initially.

After completion of the field work, its major phases were independently checked: (a) the original selection of households from the listings was verified to establish that the appropriate sampling rates were applied and the correct procedures for choosing eligible homes were followed; (b) all questionnaires were compared with the listings to ascertain that the correct households were approached; (c) completed questionnaires were inspected to establish that the household head had been interviewed and that the respondent and interviewer were of the same race; and (d) the specific disposition of every home designated for the samples, originally or subsequently, was determined wherever possible, usually from an examination of the questionnaires and field records.

Sample Description and Representativeness

The disposition of all households designated for the two samples appears in Table 5. Households are classified in this table by lister's rating on the house type scale, collapsed into the following categories: upper ("excellent dwellings," "very good dwellings," and "good dwellings"), middle ("average dwellings"), and lower ("fair dwellings," "poor dwellings," and "very poor dwellings").

A total of 315 households were designated in the white sample and 448 in the black. Thirteen of these in the white sample were deleted, mainly because the assignment card for the household was not returned; 92 were dropped in the black, all but one because of interviewer

irregularities. (Virtually all of these deleted households--10 in the white sample and 91 in the black--were replaced, as described previously.)

After these deletions, 302 households remained designated in the white sample and 356 in the black. Twenty households in the white sample and 96 in the black were ineligible, typically because the former were vacant and the latter were occupied by whites. A total of 282 homes in the white sample were eligible, and interviews were completed with 225 (79.8%) of them; for the black sample, 260 were eligible and interviews were completed with 206 (79.2%). The completion rates did not differ for the "upper," "middle," and "lower" rated households in either sample ($\chi^2 [2] = 3.86, p > .05$, two-tailed, for whites; $\chi^2 = 2.24, p > .05$, two-tailed, for blacks). In both samples, refusals were the main reason for failure to complete interviews in eligible households, accounting for 28 (9.9%) of the eligible homes in the white sample and 36 (13.8%) in the black. The refusal rates did not differ for the three categories of households in either sample ($\chi^2 [2] = .32, p > .05$, two-tailed, for whites; $\chi^2 = 3.75, p > .05$, two-tailed, for blacks).

Insert Table 5 about here

Table 6 shows the number of sample segments from which were drawn the designated households (after deletions), eligible ones, and those providing completed interviews in the two samples. The mean and standard deviation of the number of households per segment, for these three kinds of households, also appear in this table. For the whites, households

were designated in 161 segments, eligible ones were in 155, and those providing interviews were in 139. The corresponding mean number of households per segment was 1.88, 1.82, and 1.62, respectively. For the blacks, households were designated in 147 segments, eligible ones were in 128, and those with interviews were in 117; the means were 2.42, 2.03, and 1.76.

Insert Table 6 about here

The basic descriptive characteristics of the samples are reported in Tables 7 to 15. The samples were substantially different: whites being older; comprising more males, married people, and heads of simple nuclear families; and possessing higher social status and wealth.⁴ The median age (Table 7) was 52.5 for whites and 43.4 for blacks. In both samples, the majority was male (Table 8; 82.2% of whites and 65.5% of blacks); most were married (Table 9; 76.4% of whites and 56.9% of blacks); the most common household type (Table 10) was a husband and wife with children and no other relatives or nonrelatives (46.4% of whites and 33.7% of blacks); and the median number of persons in the home (Table 11) was 3. The median family income (Table 12) was \$8,708 for whites and \$4,958 for blacks; and the most common current occupation (Table 13) for whites was retired (17.2%), followed by managers, officials, and proprietors (15.3%); and for blacks was operatives and kindred workers (21.9%), followed by retired (14.6%). The median years of education (Table 14) was 11.8 for whites and 9.7 for blacks, and the median interviewer's rating of social class (Table 15) was 3.0 ("upper lower class") in both samples.

Insert Tables 7 to 15 about here

Some of these sample characteristics as well as others can be compared with data on households and their heads reported for Lucas County in the 1960 and 1970 censuses (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962a, Table 106; 1962b, Tables H-1 and H-3; 1971a, Tables 14 and 17; 1971b, Table 36). These results appear in Tables 16 to 21. Because the samples were drawn in 1967-1968, these comparisons are not entirely precise due to time differences. In all of the analyses for blacks, it should also be noted that the 1960 census data are reported for nonwhites, not blacks. However, the latter comprised 98.8% of nonwhites in Lucas County at that time (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b, Table P-1).

The available data for both samples were roughly similar to the corresponding census statistics for the two years, the most striking divergence being that the white sample owned somewhat more homes.⁵ The median age (Table 16) for whites was 52.5 in the sample, 48.1 in the 1960 census, and 49.0 in the 1970 census; the corresponding black medians were 43.4, 43.2, and 44.0. The percentage of males (Table 17) for whites was 82.2% in the sample and 82.9% and 78.9% in the two censuses; the statistics for blacks were 65.5%, 73.8%, and 65.5%. The median number of persons in the home (Table 18) for both whites and blacks was 3 in the samples as well as in the censuses. The median persons per room (Table 19) for whites was .42 in the sample and .51 and .45 in the censuses; the black medians were .47, .63, and .52. The

median number of rooms in the home (Table 20) for whites was 6 in the sample and 5 in the 1970 census--the 1960 census data were not available; the black medians were 5 in the sample and both censuses. The percentage of owner occupied homes (Table 21) for whites was 82.0% in the sample and 72.5% and 70.7% in the censuses; the black percentages were 40.3%, 47.1%, and 48.3%.

Insert Tables 16-21 about here

Questionnaire

A highly structured questionnaire was developed to assess variables that fall roughly into four categories:

a. Those that directly reflected major theoretical dimensions. In order to restrict coverage to manageable proportions, dimensions stemming from the conceptions of Weber (1946, 1947), Warner (Warner & Lunt, 1941; Warner, et al., 1949), and Centers (1949) were emphasized in view of their special relevance. Dimensions associated with other theories, especially those of Marx (Marx, 1967; Marx & Engels, 1932) and Davis and Moore (Davis & Moore, 1945; Moore, 1963), were also considered to some extent. Several aspects of Weber's economic component were minimally represented by variables because of inherent difficulty in operationalizing the conception. In addition, only a sample was included of the large number of variables tapping life chances, associated with Weber's economic dimension; and life styles, which are linked with his social status dimension.

Some of the variables came directly from the theories; others stemmed from the relevant literature, mainly previous empirical work; and the remainder were especially derived for this research. The content areas involved were social status, wealth, power, class consciousness, psychological gratification, home and possessions, life chances and life styles, and attitudes and values.

b. Those that represented explicit indexes of social stratification. They included all of the commonly used measures, whether standardized or ad hoc, as well as other variables that were found to be important in previous factor analyses. The variables in this category included most of the previously listed content areas.

c. Those that tapped well established correlates of social stratification. In view of the vast array of pertinent variables, it was only possible to include a few from each of a variety of areas. The topics covered were home and possessions, background and family situation, child rearing, buying behavior, leisure time activities, occupationally related issues, aspirations, mobility and inconsistency in status, impulse expression, and politics and religion.

d. Those that concerned relevant controls and descriptive characteristics of the respondent (e.g., social desirability response style, household type).

The 124 basic questions and ratings used to measure the four sets of variables were adapted wherever possible from those used in previous

research. A copy of the questionnaire appears in the appendix; a listing of the sources of the questions and ratings is given in Table A-1 in the appendix.

The length of the interview is reported in Table 22 for the two samples. The median was 101.6 minutes for whites and 94.3 for blacks.

Insert Table 22 about here

Other Data Sources

Variables were also secured from other sources of data: area and home ratings made by listers during the sampling process, characteristics of the interview and interviewer reported in field records, and census tract statistics from the 1960 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b, Tables H-1 and H-2).

Editing and Coding

A 90-page editing manual and a 137-page coding manual were prepared for coding 489 variables from the questionnaire and the other sources.⁶ Both manuals covered general principles as well as specific instructions for particular questions and ratings. The editing manual described processing of the questionnaire prior to coding (a) to eliminate incorrect information by changing responses to make them consistent with others as well as with the interviewers' instructions and (b) to simplify the coding by totaling separate responses or converting different ones to the same basis. The coding manual delineated the translation of

information from the questionnaire and other material into numerical scales and qualitative categories.

The codes were adapted wherever possible from those used in other research. In instances where new ones were needed for open ended questions, the codes were developed, in part, from answers on the interviewers' practice questionnaires. Some of the codes for open ended questions were subsequently revised on the basis of answers encountered in processing the actual questionnaires.

Prior to editing and coding, photographic copies were made of all of the questions and ratings on the questionnaires that might directly indicate the respondent's race or his or her level on the basic social stratification dimensions of social status, economic position, power, and class consciousness.⁷ These responses were then deleted. The copies served as supplementary questionnaires and were separately edited and coded. The original questionnaires were randomly divided into batches of 25 to be edited and coded together, with the constraint that every set contained the same proportion of white and black ones. The supplementary questionnaires were also divided into batches with exactly the same composition as those for the original ones.

The editing and coding were done in separate stages, all of the editing being executed first. Both kinds of work were carried out by the same people, 16 men and women, all of whom had attended college. The initial editing training consisted of a one-day session covering the background of the study, general procedures for processing the questionnaires, and main principles of editing. The editors then filled

out a blank questionnaire, studied the general instructions in the editing manual, read the specific material for the first section of questions and ratings assigned to them, and edited several of the interviewers' practice questionnaires. The assignment was discussed by a supervisor and the editors in a group. The editing of these questionnaires was then individually reviewed by the supervisor, and any problems were discussed.

Editing of the actual questionnaires then began. A sample of five or more from each editor's first batch was reviewed by a supervisor and discussed with the person before he or she did any further work. The editor then made any corrections that were needed. Samples of each subsequent batch were also inspected and discussed, corrections being made where necessary. This entire process was repeated for each new set of questions and ratings that was assigned to the editors.

Changes needed in the editing manual because of ambiguities or unanticipated situations were made immediately, and the editors involved were asked to make any necessary revisions in the questionnaires already processed.

Editors were assigned to three- or four-person teams, each group working on the same section of questions and ratings. More than one team usually did the same section of the basic questionnaires. When a set of questions and ratings was completed, the team was then assigned to a new one. Every section of the supplementary questionnaires was assigned to the same team--with a few minor exceptions, these individuals

did not edit any sections of the basic questionnaires after they began working on the supplementary ones. Each section of every questionnaire was independently edited by at least two people, and some especially difficult sets of questions and ratings were processed by three or four. Instances where an editor disagreed with the previous editing were reconciled by a supervisor.

The coding was carried out similarly. An initial one-day training session took place at which basic procedures and principles were discussed. The coders then read the general instructions in the manual as well as the specific material for the first set of questions and ratings that they were assigned to process and coded several practice questionnaires. When open ended questions were involved, other than those concerning occupation, coders were given additional answers from the practice questionnaires to code.⁸ All of the coding was reviewed by a supervisor in a group session as well as individually.

Following this training, coding the actual questionnaires began. The work on five or more questionnaires in each person's first batch was checked by a supervisor and discussed with the coder, and any corrections were made. Samples from all subsequent batches were reviewed and corrected in the same way. And this whole process was repeated for every set of questions and ratings that was subsequently assigned.

Changes in codes resulting from ambiguities, unanticipated situations, and "Other" answer categories were made as soon as possible; the coders involved were asked to redo any questionnaires that had already been processed.⁹

Coders worked in two- to four-person teams, each group processing the same set of questions and ratings. In general, more than one team worked on the same section of the basic questionnaires. When a section was completed, the team was assigned to a new one. All of the sections of the supplementary questionnaires were coded by the same team, and this group did not do any work on the basic questionnaires. Each section of every questionnaire was coded independently by two coders.

A preliminary comparison was made by hand of the two sets of coded scores for each variable, and disagreements were identified. Disagreements were independently coded by people who had worked on the questions or ratings involved, but had not processed the particular questionnaires. In all, 93.4% (1,856) of the 1,988 disagreements for whites and 90.8% (1,327) of the 1,461 for blacks were coded by a third person. The remainder were not coded because they had been overlooked when the scores were compared, the third person did the wrong variable, or no one was available to do the new work.

Reconciling Coder Disagreements

All of the corresponding scores for the two sets of coders were subsequently compared by computer, and any discrepancies were reconciled. When one of the discrepant scores agreed with the third, it was used. When neither agreed with the third or the latter was not available, a score of Not Ascertained was assigned.

The percentage of disagreements between coders for each variable in the two samples was computed together with the corresponding intraclass correlation between the two sets of coders' scores. All scores, whether substantive or procedural (e.g., Not Ascertained, Don't Know, and Inapplicable), were considered in counting disagreements, but the latter were excluded in computing correlations. Hence, respondents who had been assigned such scores on a variable by one or both coders were omitted in its correlational analysis. This correlational analysis was also restricted to variables that represented ordinal or interval scales; nominal variables, such as census (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1960) occupation and industry codes, were excluded.

The percentage of disagreements for the variables ranged from 0.0% to 24.4% for whites and 0.0% to 19.4% for blacks. Ten percent or more disagreements occurred for 16 variables in the white sample and 11 in the black, all of the latter 11 being among the 16 white variables. Virtually all of the 16 involved Hollingshead (1957), Warner et al., or census codes for occupation questions.

The intraclass correlations for the variables ranged from .00 to 1.00 in each sample. Excluding those that had no variation or were based on 3 or fewer respondents, 35 variables for whites and 37 for blacks had correlations under .80, 17 being common to the two samples. The variables with low correlations involved a wide variety of open ended questions.

Editing Reconciled Codes

The reconciled scores were edited to produce a master set. Scores were changed to Not Ascertained or Inapplicable if they (a) were inconsistent with related variables, on the basis of rules in the editing and coding manuals or on logical grounds; or (b) represented nonexistent values for a variable. Nearly all of the discrepancies involved inconsistent scores, most of which resulted from the process of reconciling coder disagreements. The percentage of discrepancies for each variable, based on the number of changed scores, was computed in the two samples. The percentages ranged from 0.0% to 9.8% for whites and 0.0% to 7.8% for blacks.

Derivation of New Variables

A total of 605 new variables were developed from the basic coded ones in order to describe sample characteristics, for the main statistical analysis, or for possible use in subsequent research.¹⁰ As in the case of the basic variables, the new ones were modeled, wherever possible, after those used in previous studies. The variables were developed in two stages: (a) an initial set of 509 were obtained; and (b) 96 additional were secured, mainly on the basis of analyses of the first set. The latter work was done separately for the two samples; the emphasis throughout was on identifying or deriving variables that functioned similarly in both. This effort consisted of (a) small factor analyses to combine variables into scales and, in cases where matching factors

were not obtained, select variables with high communalities in each sample; and (b) analyses of frequency distributions to choose variables with high endorsement frequencies in instances where insufficient variables were available for factor analysis, construct indexes, and determine appropriate codes (e.g., corresponding to percentiles or score intervals).

Scores on the new variables were obtained from the master scores for use in the main analysis. In addition, the new scores were derived from (a) the original scores for the two sets of coders in order to evaluate coder disagreement and (b) the reconciled scores for the purpose of assessing editing discrepancies.

Psychometric Properties of New Variables and Selection of Variables

The number of substantive scores, percentage of coder disagreements, intraclass correlation between the scores for the two sets of coders, and percentage of editing discrepancies were computed for each new variable in the two samples. Internal-consistency reliability, assessed by coefficient alpha, was also obtained for the variables where it could be estimated.

Three broad groups of variables were selected from a larger preliminary set for use in the study: (a) 11 solely describing the sample; (b) 59 in the basic factor analysis--representing major theoretical dimensions as well as indexes of social stratification; and (c) 85 in the supplementary analysis--primarily reflecting correlates of stratification and control variables, but including a few applicable only to

one race as well as some tapping major dimensions together with several indexes that had marginal psychometric characteristics or were dependent on others in the basic analysis. The supplementary analysis was designed to estimate indirectly the composition of the 85 variables in terms of the factors identified in the basic analysis. It was not feasible to include the basic and supplementary variables in the same analysis, mainly because of their large number and heterogeneity, but also because of the dependence between the two sets of variables.

All of the variables were selected for their theoretical and empirical relevance. In the case of those for which alternative versions existed, the choice was based on variation in score distributions, number of respondents with substantive scores, and use of the variants in previous research. In addition, the selection of variables for the basic analysis was guided by the psychometric and dependence data described below, the focus being on identifying for possible rejection variables that were inadequate in both samples. The final choice weighed these considerations along with the variables' potential importance.

Number of respondents with substantive scores. Ten variables were based on a relatively small number (< 90%) of substantive scores in both samples: Own Occupation (197 for whites, 183 for blacks), Main Support's Occupation (194, 172), Main Support's Education (163, 146), Source of Income (187, 150), Number of Employees Supervised (191, 171), Believes That There Are Two or More Social Classes (180, 169), Housing Expenditures (188, 149), Rent--Actual or Estimated (194, 170), Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale (124, 161), and Chapin's (1935) Social

Status scale--original weights (50, 83). The last two variables were shifted to the supplementary analysis because of their unusually small numbers as well as their secondary importance.

Percentage of coder disagreements and intraclass correlation between scores for coders. Four variables had consistently high percentages ($> 10\%$) of coder disagreements in both samples: Own Occupation (21.8% for whites, 13.1% for blacks), Main Support's Occupation (14.7%, 15.0%), Friend's Occupation (20.9%, 16.5%), and Number of Spare Time Activities (20.0%, 13.1%). No variables had consistently low ($< .80$) intraclass correlations in both samples between scores for coders. Jointly considering the two kinds of data, all of the variables were retained.

Percentage of editing discrepancies. None of the variables had a high percentage ($> 10\%$) of editing discrepancies in either sample.

Internal-consistency reliability. Reliability was consistently low ($< .80$) in the two samples for all of the variables on which this information was available: Number of Organization Memberships (.15 for whites, .13 for blacks), Possessions (.67, .68), Number of Spare Time Activities (-.58, -.70), Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale (.50, .34), and Chapin's Social Status scale--original weights (.57, .70). The last two variables had already been shifted to the supplementary analysis, because they were based on a small number of scores; the others were retained due to their importance.

Algebraic and experimental independence. Two pairs of variables were algebraically dependent (i.e., one variable was a component of the

other): Number of Organization Memberships vs. Belongs to a Union, and Housing Expenditures vs. Rent--Actual or Estimated. Number of Organization Memberships and Belongs to a Union had a product-moment correlation of only .12 for whites and .16 for blacks. Housing Expenditures and Rent--Actual or Estimated were only dependent for those who rent. Such respondents represented a small portion of the white sample (37 of 205 with usable data), but a large part of the black (105 of 176 with data). However, the correlation between the two variables in the black subgroup of homeowners (N = 53 with data), where no dependence existed, was .39, roughly similar to the correlation of .53 for the entire black sample (N = 149 with data). All four variables were retained in view of the minimal dependence involved.

One pair of variables were experimentally dependent (i.e., two or more variables being based on the same question or rating, or the same rating made by different raters): Own Occupation and Own Occupation--Centers' power. The two, which correlated .39 for whites and .26 for blacks, were retained because of their moderate dependence as well as their importance.

All of the basic variables in the study, their sources, and the questions, ratings, or other material on which they are based appear in Table 23; the corresponding information for the supplementary variables is given in Table 24. The number of substantive scores, percentage of coder disagreements, intraclass correlation between the scores for the two sets of coders, and percentage of editing discrepancies

appear in Table 25 for the basic variables in the two samples; the statistics for the supplementary variables are shown in Table 26. The reliability in each sample of the basic and supplementary variables, where these data are available, is reported in Tables 27 and 28, respectively.

Insert Tables 23 to 28 about here

Statistical Analysis

Factor analysis. The factor analyses were carried out separately for the white and black samples. Product-moment correlations were computed between the entire set of basic and supplementary variables, the number of respondents on which each correlation was based varying because of missing data. A first-order factor analysis, using the principal axis method, was carried out on the 59 x 59 correlation matrix for the basic variables. The number of factors was determined by two joint criteria: (a) the latent roots greater than one in an initial factor analysis, employing unity as the diagonal value for each variable; and (b) discontinuities in the distribution of roots in another preliminary factor analysis, using as the diagonal value for each variable its squared multiple correlation with the others. The factor analysis was completed with iterated communalities, using the squared multiple correlations as initial estimates. In the event that the criteria for the number of factors disagreed, the factor analysis was completed for both solutions and the one chosen in which the standard deviation of its

residual correlations was closest to that of a population correlation of zero (McNemar, 1942). Factors were rotated to oblique simple structure by the promax procedure (Hendrickson & White, 1964), using powers of 2 and 4. The rotation was selected that yielded the highest hyperplane count--the number of loadings (i.e., correlations with reference vectors) of $< .10$ (Cattell, 1952). Loadings of the supplementary variables on the factors were estimated by extension methods (Dwyer, 1937).

A second-order factor analysis was conducted with the correlation matrix for the rotated factors obtained at the first-order level, using the same procedures employed in that analysis. And, in turn, a third-order analysis was carried out with the second-order factors, again employing the same procedures. The loadings of the basic and supplementary variables on the second- and third-order factors were estimated by the Cattell-White procedure (Cattell, 1965).

The correspondence between the first-order factors in the two samples was evaluated from the loadings of the basic variables, using the coefficient of congruence and visual inspection. The similarity between higher order factors, because of the small matrices involved, was appraised solely by inspection of the loadings of the lower order factors on the higher order ones.

Cluster analyses. The cluster analysis was done in the white sample for the six variables with salient loadings ($> .30$) on the first-order social status factor. Scores on these variables were transformed to T scores, and D^2 's (Cronbach & Gleser, 1953) were computed between the respondents'

profiles, the D^2 's being adjusted for missing data by prorating on the basis of available scores. The 225 x 225 D^2 matrix was separately analyzed by two clustering procedures: Carlson's (1972) and Ward's (1963). Carlson's is directly based on the principle that every member of a cluster should be more like the others in it than like anyone else. Both the number and size of clusters is unrestricted, being determined solely by the data, and every individual is not necessarily placed in one of them. Ward's entails a hierarchical approach, each individual initially representing a separate cluster, and these, in turn, being combined at various levels, until one cluster encompassing the entire sample is formed. The optimal number of clusters can be identified by examining discontinuities in the objective function, reflecting within group variation, for each successive level of the combining process (Rogers & Linden, 1973).

The significance of the clusters obtained by each procedure was evaluated by (a) one-way and multivariate analyses of variance of the six social status variables, in T score form; and (b) one-way analysis of variance of the social status factor score. The scores on the factor were obtained by the complete estimation method and transformed to T scores (Harman, 1967). In the multivariate analyses, which were adjusted for missing data, lambda statistics (Wilks, 1932) were computed, and their significance was evaluated by an approximate F ratio (Rao, 1952). In addition, mean factor scores for the clusters were inspected visually.

The correspondence between the clusters obtained with the two procedures was assessed by computing D^2 s between the clusters' mean profiles on the six variables (T score form). The overlap among respondents in the matching clusters identified in this way was assessed by computing unweighted kappa coefficients (Cohen, 1960; Fleiss, Cohen, & Everitt, 1969).

Results and Discussion

First-Order Factors¹¹

Eighteen first-order factors were identified for the white sample and 19 for the black. These factors, after iteration, accounted for 53.8% of the total variance for whites and 54.4% for blacks. The percentage of variance associated with each factor in the two samples appears in Table 29. These percentages for whites ranged from 18.9% for Factor I to .9% for Factor XVIII; for blacks, they went from 13.4% for Factor I to .9% for Factor XIX.

Insert Table 29 about here

The correlations between the rotated factors in each sample are shown in Table 30. The correlations were generally moderate, ranging for whites from .67 to -.40, with a median absolute correlation of .17, and for blacks from .53 to -.55, with a median of .18.

Insert Table 30 about here

The rotated factor loadings and the communalities of the basic variables in each sample are reported in Tables 31 and 32. The estimated loadings and communalities of the supplementary variables are given in Tables 33 and 34. Thirteen white and 15 black factors were interpretable from the loadings for both the basic and supplementary variables.

Insert Tables 31 to 34 about here

Five white and six black factors matched (one white factor corresponded to two black factors). The matches involved the six highest coefficients of congruence, ranging from .58 to .73, and all of the factors were interpretable ones. The matching factors were white I and black II, white II and black I as well as black III, white IV and black VI, white VIII and black VIII, and white XII and black X.

The salient loadings ($> .30$) of the basic and supplementary variables on the interpretable factors are listed below. In these listings, the basic variables appear before the supplementary ones, and any of the latter that were algebraically or experimentally dependent on the former are shown in parentheses. The five matching factors are presented first, followed by the others--eight for whites and nine for blacks.

Matching white and black factors.

Matching: White I, Black II

	<u>White I</u>	<u>Black II</u>
Interviewer's rating of grammar	.55	.65
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	.49	.57
Interviewer's rating of social class	.37	.32
Own education--years	.35	.43
Friend's occupation--Duncan	.46	--
Own Occupation--Duncan	.44	--
(Intergeneration educational mobility)	.34	.33
(Blau and Duncan's Intergeneration Occupational Mobility Score)	.42	--
Interviewer's rating of frankness	--	.42
(Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position)	.41	--
Preferred job for self--Duncan	.40	--
Educational aspirations for self--years	--	.30

This relatively broad matching factor, defined by variables derived from interviewers' ratings as well as respondents' reports, obviously represents social status. Interestingly, this factor was not loaded by variables based on respondents' direct reports of their social status--Self-report of Comparative Social Standing or Centers' (1949) Class Identification measure. A striking difference between the samples is that Own Occupation and Friend's Occupation did not appear on this factor

for blacks, although consistent with previous results, they did for whites. This matching factor is very similar to one found in all of the previous investigations.

Matching: White II, Black I and III

	White II	Black I	III
Interviewer's rating of dwelling area	.61	.69	--
Self-report of comparative neighborhood quality	.59	.63	--
Census: Median house value for census tract	.52	--	.82
Census: Median rent for census tract	.45	--	.48
Interviewer's rating of house type	.35	.67	--
Census: Percent deteriorating and dilapidated housing for census tract	-.40	--	-.64
Interviewer's rating of social class	--	.36	--
(Lister's rating of dwelling area)	.44	.47	--
(Lister's rating of house type)	.39	.45	--
(Warner et al.'s Index of Status Characteristics)	--	.64	--
Interviewer's rating of building condition	--	.45	--
Chapin's Social Status scale--original weights	.34	--	--
Neighbor's occupation--Duncan	.31	--	--

This matching factor clearly involves residence. It is especially interesting that the single factor for whites, encompassing all of the sources of variables in this study--interviewers' and listers' ratings, respondents' reports, and census information, splits into two for blacks, one for the ratings and reports, the other for the census data. The pair correlated .43. This matching factor is highly similar to one identified in all of the earlier studies.

Matching: White IV, Black VI

	<u>White IV</u>	<u>Black VI</u>
Number of organization memberships	.67	.70
Number of organizations that take stands on public issues	.55	.61
Number of leadership positions in organizations	.59	--
Family savings	--	.32
Attendance at organization meetings	.47	.36
Date of interview	--	.34
Chapin's Social Status scale--original weights	--	.34
(Spare time activities: Active sports and recreation)	--	.31

This relatively specific matching factor taps organization activity.

Matching: White VIII, Black VIII

	<u>White VIII</u>	<u>Black VIII</u>
Takes active part in local issues	.70	.72
Had contact with officials or politicians about something he/she wanted	.46	.30
People ask for his/her opinions	--	.38
Decision maker in community affairs	--	.30
(Number of all contacts with officials or politicians)	.61	.41
(Number of successful contacts with officials or politicians)	.33	--
Chapin's Social Status scale--Guttman weights	-.31	--

This matching factor seems to be an amalgam of political activity and efficacy. The white version of this factor is narrower than the black one, encompassing only activity. Political efficacy for whites is represented by another factor (XI) that did not correlate ($r = .18$) with the present factor's white form or match (coefficient = .34) this factor's black counterpart. It is also noteworthy that Self-report of Comparative Influence and Power did not load this matching factor.

Matching: White XII, Black X

	<u>White XII</u>	<u>Black X</u>
Main support's education--years	.53	.73
Main support's occupation--Duncan	.52	.45
(Blau and Duncan's Intergeneration Occupational Mobility score)	-.66	-.52
(Intergeneration educational mobility)	-.73	-.69
Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale--revised	--	.33

This matching factor clearly reflects the social status of the respondent's main support (i.e., father, mother, or surrogate) during childhood. Contrary to the situation involving the matching factor for respondent's social status, the pertinent occupation variable--Main Support's Occupation--defined the present factor for blacks as well as whites. A highly similar factor was found by Artz et al. (1971).

Other white factors.

Factor III

Sex is male	.65
Persons per room	.46
Self-report of comparative income and wealth	.37
Possessions	.34
Own income--in 1,000's	.32
Marital status--married	.74
Currently employed full time	.52
(Number in nuclear family in home)	.46
(Number in total family in home)	.46
(Number of persons in home)	.45
(Own or family income--in 1,000's)	.37
Intrageneration income mobility	.33
Current or last job: Length of time employed	.32
Activities in past week: Worked on car	.32
Broken family	-.31
Age at first job	-.36
Chapin's Social Status scale--original weights	-.39

Factor III seems to involve the intactness of the family, rather than sex, per se. Sex is Male indirectly reflects intactness because of the designation of men as respondents in households where both a

husband and wife were present. This intactness interpretation is also supported by the loadings for Marital Status and Broken Family. It is noteworthy that several key income variables--Self-report of Comparative Income and Wealth, Own Income, and Own or Family Income--appeared on this factor, although their loadings were relatively low.

Factor V

Age--years	.56
Family savings	.54
Owner vs. renter of home	.37

Current or last job: Length of time employed	.53
Length of time in Toledo	.36
Voting frequency in elections	.31
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale--revised	.31
Intrageneration income mobility	-.30
Expected changes in future income	-.33

This factor appears to be age, in view of the defining loading for Age and the loadings for other age related variables--Current or Last Job: Length of Time Employed and Length of Time in Toledo.

Factor VI

Extent of success in life	.54
Self-report of comparative social standing	.32
Number of times unemployed	-.49

Current or last job: Chances of advancement	.34
Number of jobs held	-.37

Factor VI obviously taps occupational success.

Factor VII

Family debts	.58
Housing expenditures	.42
Food expenditures	.35

Broken family	.35
(Number of rooms in home)	.32
Chapin's Social Status scale--Guttman weights	-.43
Chapin's Social Status scale--original weights	-.49

This factor seems to involve household expenses. An alternative interpretation as a level of living factor is inconsistent with the negative loadings for Chapin's (1935) Social Status scale (original and Guttman, 1942, weights), which should reflect this characteristic.

Factor IX

Own occupation--Centers' power	.51
Personal vs. impersonal factors in getting ahead on a job	.40
Source of income	.34

Current or last job: Self-employed vs. works for someone else	.54
Chapin's Social Status scale--Guttman weights	.40

Factor IX represents being self-employed, a characteristic shared by three disparate variables loading this factor: Own Occupation--Centers' power, Source of Income, and Current or Last Job: Self-employed vs. Works for Someone Else.

Factor X

Protestant religious preference	.62
Republican political party preference	.41
Congenial vs. economic considerations in choosing a job	.35

Own nationality--Lenski	.31
(Spare time activities: Active sports and recreation)	-.34
Chapin's Social Status scale--original weights	-.43

This factor seems to be majority group membership, judging from the loadings for Protestant Religious Preference, Republican Political Party Preference, and Own Nationality (Lenski, 1954, scoring). (Another

version of the latter variable, based on Rossi scoring,¹² did not appear on the factor.) An alternative interpretation of Factor X as conservatism is inconsistent with the absence of Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale. A majority group membership factor, defined by a race or ethnic group variable, was found by Artz et al.

Factor XI

Thinks public officials care about him/her	.51
Decision maker in community affairs	.33
Says workers like unions, and businessmen do not	-.34

(Number of all contacts with officials or politicians)	.33
--	-----

Chapin's Social Status scale--Guttman weights	-.41
---	------

Factor XI taps political efficacy.

Factor XV

Anomie	.52
Number of spare time activities	.37

(Spare time activities: Radio and television)	.31
---	-----

Chapin's Social Status scale--original weights	-.46
--	------

This factor seems to reflect alienation.

Other black factors.

Factor IV

Self-report of comparative social standing	.71
Self-report of comparative influence and power	.62
Self-report of comparative income and wealth	.38

None

Factor IV, consisting solely of self-reports concerning the three Weberian dimensions and the only black factor loaded by these variables, probably represents method variance. This factor can also be viewed substantively as a global dimension of stratification, but the ubiquity of method factors, even in the absence of a white one in this study, suggests that the first interpretation is more apt to be correct. The possibility that Factor IV simply represents distortion is ruled out by the absence of any loading for the Marlowe-Crowne (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) Social Desirability scale.

Factor V

Persons per room	.74
Food expenditures	.64

(Number of persons in home)	.86
(Number in total family in home)	.85
(Number in nuclear family in home)	.82
Chapin's Social Status scale--Guttman weights	-.34

This factor appears to reflect household size, rather than crowdedness, judging from the substantial loading for Food Expenditures as well as the lower loading for Persons per Room than Number of Persons in Home (used in deriving Persons per Room) and two other size variables--Number in Total Family in Home and Number in Nuclear Family in Home.

Factor VII

Source of income	.75
Own income--in 1,000's	.33
Thinks public officials care about him/her	-.31
Current or last job: Self-employed vs. works for someone else	.33
Current or last job: Length of time employed	.32
Broken family	-.35

Factor VII involves the nature of the respondent's income, mainly whether it is salary, commissions, and wages vs. welfare, unemployment compensation, and illegal income--the two major categories for Source of Income in this sample (121 of the 150 reporting were in the former and 22 in the latter).

Factor IX

Rent--actual or estimated	.69
Owner vs. renter of home	.56
Housing expenditures	.39
(Number of rooms)	.50
Interviewer's rating of building type-- private home	.37

This factor seems to tap amount of housing, rather than its quality, for the variables that explicitly concern the latter--Interviewer's Rating of House Type, Lister's Rating of House Type, and Interviewer's Rating of Building Condition--appeared on the matching residence factor. It is interesting that Factor IX only correlated .30 with the most pertinent of the matching residence factors for blacks, Factor I, which was defined by self-reports and ratings.

Factor XI

Number of officials or politicians he/she has met	.69
Family debts	.33
Republican political party preference	.33
Own occupation--Centers' power	.30
None	

The meaning of this factor is not entirely clear, but it appears to concern possession of power in both the political and occupational sense. Factor XI did not correlate ($r = .15$) with the black version of the matching political activity and efficacy factor or match (coefficient = .17) the white counterpart.

Factor XII

Authoritarianism	.58
Protestant religious preference	.37
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale--revised	.33

Factor XII probably taps basic conservative ideology, despite the absence of loadings for Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale or Republican Political Party Preference.

Factor XIII

Number of employees supervised	.79
Number of leadership positions in organizations	.32

None

This factor reflects leadership in both occupational and organizational spheres.

Factor XIV

Congenial vs. economic considerations in choosing a job	.49
Own occupation--Duncan	.34
(Warner et al.'s Index of Status Characteristics)	.45
(Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position)	.39
Interviewer: Age	.32

Factor XIV, the only black one loaded by Own Occupation, involves occupational orientation.

Factor XV

Believes there are two or more social classes	.60
---	-----

Thinks of self as being in a social class	.39
---	-----

Current or last job: Self-employed vs. works for someone else	-.31
---	------

Factor XV clearly measures class consciousness.

Second-Order Factors¹³

Six second-order factors were identified for the white sample and five for the black. The factors, after iteration, accounted for 50.4% of the variance for whites and 44.7% for blacks. The percentage of variance associated with each factor in the two samples appears in Table 35. The percentages for whites ranged from 21.9% for Factor I to 3.4% for Factor VI, and for blacks from 19.3% for Factor I to 3.6% for Factor V.

Insert Table 35 about here

The correlations between the rotated factors in the two samples are reported in Table 36. The correlations were generally moderate, going from .43 to -.13, with an absolute median of .26, for whites, and from .51 to -.01, with a median of .32, for blacks.

Insert Table 36 about here

The rotated factor loadings and the communalities in each sample are shown in Table 37. Three white and four black factors were interpretable. None of the factors matched, apart from some similarity between white III and black III.

Insert Table 37 about here

The estimated loadings of the basic variables on the second-order factors in the two samples are reported in Tables A-2 and A-3 in the appendix; the loadings of the supplementary variables are given in Tables A-4 and A-5 in the appendix. These results were not readily interpretable because of excessive overlap among the factors. In 8 of the 15 possible pairs of white factors and 6 of the 10 pairs of black ones, at least half of the basic variables with salient loadings on one factor also loaded the other (e.g., 7 of the 8 variables on white II were common to white I).

The salient loadings of the first-order factors on the interpretable second-order factors are listed below, the white results being presented first.

White factors.

Factor I

XV. Alienation	.64
II. Residence	.42
IX. Self-employed	.35
X. Majority group membership	-.43

Factor I may be minority group economic achievement, despite the high loading for Alienation.

Factor III

XVI.	Uninterpretable	.53
IV.	Organization activity	.47
XI.	Political efficacy	.44
III.	Intactness of family	.42
VIII.	Political activity and efficacy	.40

This factor appears to be political power.

Factor IV

VI.	Occupational success	.60
V.	Age	.41
IX.	Self-employed	.38
XI.	Political efficacy	.36

Factor IV involves economic success.

Black factors.

Factor I

V.	Household size	.67
XV.	Class consciousness	.60
XIX.	Uninterpretable	.58
XII.	Conservative ideology	-.58

This factor seems to tap liberal or radical political ideology.

Factor II

XVIII.	Uninterpretable	.56
VII.	Nature of income	.54
XII.	Conservative ideology	.39
IV.	Method variance	.35
XV.	Class consciousness	.32
II.	Social status	-.35
XVI.	Uninterpretable	-.56

Factor II appears to reflect conservative economic ideology.

Factor III

XVII.	Uninterpretable	.56
VI.	Organization activity	.48
II.	Social status	.45
VIII.	Political activity and efficacy	.32

This factor seems to be an amalgam of social status and power.

Factor IV

III.	Residence--census	.79
I.	Residence--reports and ratings	.31

Factor IV clearly involves residence.

Third-Order Factors¹⁴

Two third-order factors were identified in each sample, representing, after iteration, 41.0% of the variance for whites and 45.9% for blacks. The percentage of variance represented by each factor was 30.2% and 10.8% for whites and 33.6% and 12.3% for blacks; the factors correlated .07 and .25, respectively.

The rotated factor loadings and the communalities in each sample are reported in Table 38. One white and both black factors were interpretable. None of the factors matched.

Insert Table 38 about here

The estimated loadings of the basic variables on the third-order factors in each sample are given in Tables A-2 and A-3 in the appendix; the loadings of the supplementary variables are in Tables A-4 and A-5 in the appendix. These results were not easily interpretable.

The salient loadings of the second-order factors on the interpretable third-order factors are listed below, the white factor coming first.

White factor.

Factor I

I. Minority group economic achievement	.74
V. Uninterpretable	.60
IV. Economic success	.59
II. Uninterpretable	.52
III. Political power	.51

This factor may reflect economic and political influence.

Black factors.

Black I

I. Liberal or radical political ideology	.63
IV. Residence	.59
V. Uninterpretable	.48
III. Social status and power	.46

Factor I appears to tap a combination of general status and liberal political orientation.

Block II

II. Conservative economic ideology	.77
III. Social status and power	.38

This factor seems to involve mainly a conservative economic orientation.

Clusters¹⁵

Carlson analysis. Thirty-seven clusters of respondents were identified by the Carlson procedure. The clusters ranged in size from 2 to 13, the median being 4, and contained 201 of the 225 respondents. Table 39 reports for each cluster the number of respondents together with the means and standard deviations for the six social status variables (transformed to T scores) and the corresponding factor score. The factor score means for the clusters are also portrayed in Figure 1. This figure indicates that the cluster means were relatively close to each other and spanned virtually the entire score continuum, ranging from 26.00 to 68.60.

Insert Table 39 and Figure 1 about here

The degrees of freedom, mean squares, and F ratios for the one-way analyses of variance of each of the variables and the factor score appear in Table 40. In each analysis, the F ratio was significant ($p < .01$).

Insert Table 40 about here

The lambda statistic, as well as its corresponding F ratio and degrees of freedom, for the multivariate analysis of variance of the combined set of six variables is given in Table 41. Lambda was significant ($p < .01$).

Insert Table 41 about here

Table 42 reports, for the nine clusters containing nine or more respondents, the raw score means for the six variables and the substantive meaning of these statistics. The mean factor scores are also given in this table. The clusters' mean factor scores ranged from 40.00 to 66.55, and the Interviewer's Rating of Social Class from "upper lower class" to "upper middle class," four of the nine clusters being categorized as "lower middle class" and four as "upper middle class." In four instances adjacent clusters had mean factor scores within three points of each other. Two of the clusters--24 and 29--were very similar, their means on all six variables corresponding to the same substantive categories.

The pattern of means on the variables was consistent for most of the clusters and corresponded to the mean factor scores. However, clusters 20 and 21, which were categorized as "upper middle class" by the Interviewer's Rating of Social Class and had the lowest factor scores of those in this category, appeared to be more appropriately described as "lower middle class," judging from their means on Own Occupation and Own Education. Own Occupation was sales worker in the first and manager,

official, and proprietor in the second; and Own Education was high school graduate in both. In addition, cluster 37 had an unusual pattern of scores: Own Occupation was craftsman, foreman, and kindred worker, but Friend's Occupation was farmer and farm manager; and Own Education was three years of high school, but Interviewer's Rating of Intelligence was "slow."

Insert Table 42 about here

Ward analysis. Fifty-one clusters were identified by inspection of the objective function's distribution. This distribution is shown in Figure 2. Four clusters contained one respondent and therefore were ignored; the remaining 47 ranged in size from 2 to 13, the median being 4, and comprised 221 of the respondents. Table 43 reports for each cluster the number of respondents together with the means and standard deviations for the six variables and the factor score. The factor score means for the clusters also appear in Figure 3. This figure indicates that the means were comparatively close to each other and covered the score continuum, ranging from 28.00 to 71.00.

Insert Table 43 and Figures 2 and 3 about here

The statistics for the one-way analyses of variance appear in Table 40. All of the F ratios were significant ($p < .01$). The results for the multivariate analyses of variance are reported in Table 41. Lambda was significant ($p < .01$).

The means for the six variables and the substantive meaning of these statistics for the six clusters with nine or more respondents are given in Table 44, together with the mean factor scores for the clusters. The clusters' mean factor scores ranged from 45.64 to 64.09, and the Interviewer's Rating of Social Class from "lower middle class" to "upper middle class," two clusters being classified as the former and four as the latter. In two instances adjacent clusters had mean factor scores within three points of each other, but all six clusters were distinctly different in terms of the substantive meaning of their scores on the variables. In general, the clusters' patterns of means on the variables were consistent and corresponded to the mean factor scores. However, clusters 1 and 4, which were categorized as "upper middle class" by the Interviewer's Rating of Social Class, seemed to be better characterized as "lower middle class"; in both, Own Occupation was manager, official, and proprietor; and Own Education was high school graduate.

Insert Table 44 about here

Comparison of Carlson and Ward clusters.¹⁶ In 31 of 37 possible instances in the analysis of D^2 s between the mean profiles for the Carlson and Ward clusters, when a Carlson cluster's lowest D^2 was with a particular Ward cluster, the latter's lowest D^2 was with the same Carlson cluster. The 31 matching Carlson clusters included 5 of the 9 largest ones and contained 149 respondents; the 31 Ward counterparts involved all of the 6 largest clusters and comprised 165 respondents.

Overall, 93 respondents were common to the two sets of matching clusters. Table 45 reports the D^2 for each matching cluster together with the percentage of common respondents and the kappa coefficient. Twenty-nine of these coefficients, ranging from .28 to 1.00, were significant ($p < .05$, one-tailed) and represented from 96.0% to 100.0% common respondents.

Insert Table 45 about here

Conclusions

First-Order and Higher Order Factors

In contrast to the relatively clear, though narrow, first-order factors obtained in this study, the higher order ones were broader as well as heterogeneous, and correspondingly more difficult to interpret. This outcome is consistent with the Artz et al. (1971) finding that the second-order factors in their investigation were not replicable across communities. The reason for this lack of clarity and stability at the second- and third-order levels is uncertain; these factors might be expected to represent relatively general but perhaps even more meaningful dimensions than the lower order ones, in line with the usual results in the ability and personality areas (Cattell, 1971, 1973). Whatever may cause the higher order factors in this study to take the form that they do, the discussion of the present findings necessarily focuses on the first-order level.

Clearly the most striking feature of the results was their extraordinary complexity, which was unanticipated on the basis of existing conceptualizations and earlier research. This complexity was reflected in the absence of large general factors as well as in the number of factors obtained, many of which were not congruent with the theories and previous findings or differed in important ways for whites and blacks.

Correspondence of Factors with Conceptualizations

Each of the leading conceptualizations received some degree of support from the present factors, mainly those in the first-order analysis. In many cases, though, the theoretical dimensions were not precisely verified, and the confirmation did not extend to both samples. Additionally, the extremely wide scope of the obtained factors indicated that even the most elaborate formulations are overly simplistic. These outcomes point up the need for an articulated theory that takes into account the extraordinary differentiation existing in this sphere.

Of the three Weberian (Weber, 1946, 1947) dimensions--social status, economic position, and power--the last one was mostly clearly confirmed in this study. The power component, which involves the possession of political power through organizational action, was directly reflected in the matching organization activity factor. More indirect support for this aspect came from the matching political activity and efficacy as well as the white political efficacy factors. The factors, although not substantially correlated, loaded the same second-order factors--political power for whites and social status and power for blacks.

The findings for the social status dimension suggest that it is not monolithic, but differentiated into relatively distinct components. Social status, according to Weber, rests on three bases: life styles, which result in the restriction of social intercourse; education; and prestige of birth or occupation. Support for each of these aspects was apparent in three matching factors: social status, an amalgam of education and life styles; main support's social status, a merger of occupation and education; and residence, an important reflection of life styles (Svalastoga, 1965). Added support stemmed from two other factors--white household expenses and black amount of housing--that are other manifestations of life styles. However, this entire set of factors generally correlated only moderately--the exception being the appreciable correlation for whites between the matching social status and residence factors, and none of them loaded the same second-order factor. Furthermore, some of the life style variables in the study were not included on these factors.

The results confirmed the existence of an economic dimension for whites, despite sparse coverage of the relevant variables, but provide little evidence of it for blacks. This dimension involves three aspects: possession and acquisition of goods, including income from property and securities; life chances; and subjective satisfaction or frustration. Variables from each of these areas were represented in the study, but in a limited way, and very few concern the possession and acquisition component. None of the matching factors bore on this

dimension, and all but one of those that were relevant came from the white sample. The pertinent white factors were self-employed, concerning possession and acquisition; occupational success, a combination of subjective satisfaction and life chances; and intactness of family, involving life chances as well as possession and acquisition. The solitary black factor was nature of income, also consisting of life chances together with possession and acquisition. The white factors were not highly correlated, but two of them--economic success and self-employed--loaded the second-order economic success factor.

In Marx's (Marx, 1967; Marx & Engels, 1932) conception, social class is determined by the relationship to means of production, in particular, ownership vs. nonownership of capital and land. This view is congruent with the white self-employed factor, which is loaded by all of the variables that clearly bear on this relationship, although none precisely tap it: Own Occupation--Centers' (1949) power, Source of Income, and Current or Last Job: Self-employed vs. Works for Someone Else. However, no factor of this kind was found for blacks.

Centers views social class as a psychological phenomenon, involving consciousness of membership in a class together with possession of political as well as economic attitudes and behaviors that reflect class feeling and interest. This notion was most clearly confirmed by the black class consciousness factor, which represents class awareness and identification. Centers' conception was also supported to a lesser extent by the white majority group membership factor, which reflects

political behavior and economic attitudes. It is noteworthy that some highly relevant measures of Centers' construct, especially two variables from his own work—Centers' Class Identification measure and Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale, did not appear on either of these factors and had only minor loadings on the others.

Warner (Warner & Lunt, 1941; Warner et al., 1949) focuses on social status, which he sees as deriving from evaluation by members of the community--the ultimate criterion being participation in social interaction with others of the same class and acceptance by them. This conception is consistent with the matching social status factor, which encompasses several variables that carry prestige in this society, including one of the most important: Own Education. In addition, the white version of this factor was loaded by Friend's Occupation, an indicator of social interaction and acceptance; as well as Own Occupation, another central determinant of prestige. However, a few variables that reflect prestige were not included on this factor.

Davis and Moore (Davis & Moore, 1945; Moore, 1963) view several kinds of rewards as reflecting stratification--major ones being sustenance and comfort, humor and diversion, and self-respect and ego expansion; and others consisting of disposable time and material goods or money. Three of these were clearly confirmed in this investigation: sustenance and comfort, self-respect and ego expansion, and material goods or money. Of the two rewards not supported, humor and diversion was only represented by a single variable--Number of Spare Time Activities, and disposable time

was not tapped at all. Sustenance and comfort was reflected by the matching residence, white household expenses, and black amount of housing factors. Self-respect and ego expansion was involved in the matching social status and white occupational success factors. And material goods or money was tapped by two white factors: intactness of family, a merger of income and possessions; and age, which includes savings and home ownership. However, the factors corresponding to a reward correlated only moderately with each other and did not load the same second-order factor.

Congruence with Previous Factors

The greater complexity of the factor analytic results in the present study than in previous investigations was undoubtedly due to the broader range of variables in this research. Despite important differences between this one and the others in the variables, samples, and procedures involved, all but two of the previously identified factors were found in the present first-order analysis, lending support to the meaning of the current results and indicating that the corresponding factors, at least, have some generality.

Most of this agreement with the previous work involved the five matching factors. Two of them--social status and residence--corresponded to the pair of factors common to all of the earlier studies, and a third--main support's social status--agreed with an Artz et al. factor. The consistency is striking with which these three factors were found in the various investigations as well as in both races in this study. In addition, the white

majority group membership factor was similar in meaning, despite differences in salient variables, to one that Artz et al. identified.

None of the present factors, however, resembled two others of Artz et al., one tapping father-in-law's as well as wife's social status and the other reflecting family income. However, the first factor could not have been uncovered in this study, because the variables involved were not in the analysis; and the second, despite being found by Artz et al. in several communities, may be unstable, for nothing of this kind was obtained in any of the earlier investigations, although they included income variables.

Among the present factors that have no counterparts in the earlier research, the most noteworthy are the two other matching ones-- organization activity together with political activity and efficacy. These factors are not only stable, at least in Toledo, having been found in both samples, but they are also clear cut and potentially important. It is not surprising that the two were not identified previously, for the other studies did not include any variables bearing even indirectly on these factors.

Correspondence Between White and Black Factors

Both the similarities as well as the differences between the white and black first-order factors are equally interesting. Only about a quarter of the factors matched, but they included most of the important ones in terms of their correspondence with the conceptualizations and previous studies. Some of the unmatched factors presumably represent

substantive differences between whites and blacks, mainly reflecting the operation of a variety of social forces on the two races; other unmatched ones, especially those that were not well defined, may simply be unstable and reflect sampling error.

Some noteworthy differences existed even on the matching factors. The failure of Own Occupation and Friend's Occupation to load the social status factor for blacks, although these variables defined the corresponding white one as well as similar factors in previous investigations based predominantly on whites, suggests that occupation has different implications for stratification in the two races. This suggestion is consistent with Glenn's (1963) finding, based on a review of community studies, that occupation is a less important determinant of social status for blacks than whites. One obvious possibility is that the variation in functioning of occupation may be due to the long run impact on blacks of discrimination and segregation.

Incidentally, this line of reasoning about the disjuncture for blacks between occupation and social status is not necessarily contradicted by the presence of Main Support's Occupation on the matching main support's social status factor for both races. This factor, a highly specific one that is limited to the two variables concerning the main support in the analysis--Main Support's Occupation and Main Support's Education, might well split apart for blacks, akin to what happened to their social status factor, if other variables describing this person were included.

The existence of two residence factors for blacks, one for the census variables and the other for the self-reports and interviewer ratings, in contrast to a single white factor encompassing both sets of variables, may stem from the existence in each race of a distinctive frame of reference for evaluating housing, the differential standards being reflected in the self-reports and ratings. The blacks' standards may not be the same as whites' because of differences in the two races' housing experiences, the minority group generally residing in poorer dwellings and worse residential areas, and many blacks living in the very worst homes and sections. Consequently, blacks' evaluations, unlike whites', may diverge sharply from objective indexes of housing quality, such as those provided by the census, resulting in the emergence of separate factors for the minority group.

Some of the factors unique to each sample not only appear to represent important differences between whites and blacks, but are also of considerable intrinsic interest in their own right. One is the white self-employed factor, notable theoretically in view of its bearing on Marx's conception of social class. Another is the white majority group membership factor, which has some resemblance to one obtained by Artz et al. Interest in this factor stems primarily from its potential generality. The black class consciousness factor is especially intriguing in view of its theoretical pertinence to Centers' notion of social class. Finally, the black factor that was tentatively interpreted as method variance is also striking, mainly in light of the puzzling absence of a similar one for whites.

The comparisons of white and black factors raise two methodological issues. One stems from the assignment of interviewers to respondents of the same race, potentially confounding inherent differences between whites and blacks with differences between them that are due to (a) interviewer bias in asking questions, recording answers, and making ratings; and (b) respondent-interviewer interaction that affects the answers obtained. However, Sudman and Bradburn (1974) found, on the basis of a review of studies that systematically varied interviewer and respondent race, that these effects, in toto, had a minor impact on attitude questions, except when white interviewers were paired with black respondents. It seems likely that factual questions are even less affected. Moreover, in the present investigation, interviewer bias in recording answers and making ratings, at least, ought to have a limited influence. Twenty-six of the 59 basic variables in the analysis involved questions with a fixed response format, which is relatively resistant to recording errors. Many of the other 24 that were based on open ended questions used highly structured ones (e.g., What was the highest grade you completed in school? [Question 32a]) eliciting very specific and circumscribed answers which are comparatively unsusceptible to recording error. And only 6 variables relied on ratings. (The three remaining variables were obtained from the census.) Furthermore, the interaction between respondents and interviewers of the same race in this study might be expected to lead to maximal validity in the answers obtained.

The only clear evidence of the effects of interviewer bias or respondent-interviewer interaction in the present findings is the split of the single residence factor for whites into two for blacks, determined by whether the variables were based on the census or self-reports and ratings. The differences between whites and blacks in functioning of the ratings vis-à-vis the census variables point to the operation of interviewer bias. On the other hand, the existence of other matching factors, including social status, which is composed of self-reports and ratings, indicates that the two effects do not have pervasive influences.

The other methodological issue involves differences between whites and blacks in their score distributions on the variables under analysis, as exemplified by the striking disparities observed between the samples on some of the key background variables. Variances, of course, affect correlations and, in turn, factor analyses, raising the possibility that both the similarities and differences between white and black factors may be attributable, at least in part, to disparities in variation. However, the purpose of the analysis was to identify dimensions present in specific populations of whites and blacks, and insofar as the samples were representative, the correlations and factor analyses, precisely because they do reflect the variances as well as other properties of the variables in the samples, accurately portray the whites and blacks. And, in any event, most of the variables had sufficient variance in each sample to generate factors. Only seven of the basic variables for whites and

nine for blacks in the first-order analyses had communalities under .50 together with no salient loadings on any factor, and three of these variables were common to both races.

Clustering of Status Groups

Clearly the most noteworthy finding in the cluster analyses was the large number of sets of respondents identified, each grouping comprising an extremely small proportion of the sample. It is interesting that the two analytic methods which were employed roughly agreed about the number of clusters and uncovered similar ones. Equally important, the clusters appeared to represent cohorts that were located at different points on an underlying continuum of social status.

It should be noted that limiting the analysis to social status variables, which were necessarily correlated, inevitably produced clusters formed largely, though not entirely, on the basis of similarity in the elevation, rather than the scatter or shape, of their profiles.¹⁷ The D^2 index used in the cluster analyses reflects, in principle, all three profile components (Cronbach & Gleser, 1953), but correlation between the variables enhances the influence of elevation (i.e., if variables correlate perfectly, all of the scores on a profile are identical, and profiles can only differ in elevation). Although these psychometric constraints lead to the clusters in this study being relatively homogeneous in elevation and mainly differing among themselves on this characteristic, these influences have no bearing on the most striking results about the clusters: their number and size, and the apparent absence of discontinuities among them.

The present findings are inconsistent with the theoretical views, associated most notably with Warner, about the existence of a small number of social classes, and the empirical results cited previously that support such a conception. The wide variety of differences between the present study and the earlier investigations make it difficult to pinpoint the source of disagreement. At first glance, the current results also appear to disagree with the outcomes of previous studies that found no evidence of distinct classes, but this contradiction is more apparent than real; the identification in this investigation of an extremely large number of ostensible classes is tantamount to finding none at all. If the population is, indeed, fractionated to this extent, it is difficult to conceive of these groupings as classes in the usual sense.

This issue clearly remains unsettled. The analyses need to be extended to blacks as well as to different dimensions of social stratification, particularly the economic and power aspects. And possible sources of differences between these findings and earlier ones need to be examined in detail.

Measurement Implications

The present results have a number of important implications for the measurement of social stratification. The most central point is that the domain is, indeed, multidimensional and hence any one index, whether based on a single variable, such as occupation or education, or on a set of variables, such as Hollingshead's (1957) Two Factor Index of Social Position or Warner et al.'s Index of Status Characteristics, cannot adequately assess the entire sphere.

Indeed, as indicated by the summary in Tables 46 to 48 of the commonly used indexes' loadings on the first-order factors, these measures did not even consistently define the factors that they presumably reflect, with the striking exception of Own Education, which had salient loadings on the matching social status factor in both samples. Own Occupation, Hollingshead's and Warner et al.'s indexes, and perhaps, Centers' Class Identification measure as well as Chapin's (1935) Social Status scale (original weights) ought to tap this factor, too, but Own Occupation and Hollingshead's index only loaded it for whites, and the other measures had no loadings in either sample. Chapin's scale is also relevant to the matching residence factor, but only loaded it for whites. Centers' measure, although pertinent to the black class consciousness factor, did not load it. And Own Income is only potentially relevant to two minor factors--white occupational success and black nature of income--and solely loaded the latter.

Insert Tables 46 to 48 about here

The best approach to dealing with the complexity in this domain is to assess the major factors separately, selecting those that are relevant for a particular purpose. All of the matching factors seem to represent important dimensions of social stratification and, hence, have wide pertinence for substantive work in this area as well as research that necessitates control for stratification influences. Some of the factors unique to whites or blacks, such as the four discussed previously, may be useful in more exploratory and specialized efforts.

Each factor may be assessed by the single variable with the highest loading, but it would be preferable, for the sake of maximizing validity and reliability, to use all of the salient variables. A related difficulty arises from the white-black differences in the factors, including the matching ones. Separate measures of the factors, even those that match, could be derived for each race, but any possible gain in accuracy stemming from such a precise operationalization of the factors would be offset by the difficulty of comparing the resulting indexes for whites and blacks. As a result, it seems desirable to use exactly the same measures for both races. Measures of the matching factors may be based on the variables that have loadings in both samples. In assessing the matching residence factor, it might be useful to obtain two indexes, one comprising the census variables and the other the self-reports and ratings, in line with this factor's division for blacks. Measures of the unique white and black factors may be derived from the variables that have loadings in the sample where the particular factor emerged. The indexes may then be used with both races to explore the measures' general applicability.

The limited findings of the cluster analyses, as well as the other studies of this topic, suggest that no firm basis exists for classifying people into social classes on the basis of their standing on any dimension of stratification. Although it may be convenient in some situations to divide individuals into categories on the basis of scores on the measures just described, such groupings are arbitrary and do not necessarily have any larger reality.

The applicability of the measures based on these factors to other communities and at other times is, of course, an empirical question. Since three of the matching factors--social status, residence, and main support's social status--were also found previously, their measures ought to be widely useful. Less certainty exists about indexes of the other matching factors or those unique to a race, but all of these measures, at the very least, are likely to be applicable for the near future to large Northern communities of which Toledo is representative.

References

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N.
The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Anderson, C. A. Regional and racial differences in relations between
income and education. School Review, 1955, 63, 38-45.
- Artz, R. D., Curtis, R. F., Fairbank, D. T., & Jackson, E. F. Community
rank stratification: A factor analysis. American Sociological Review,
1971, 36, 985-1002.
- Atherton, K. R. A comparison of solutions obtained in factor analyses of
socioeconomic variables. Psychological Reports, 1962, 11, 259-273.
- Beck, J. D. Limitations of one social class index when comparing races
with respect to indices of health. Social Forces, 1967, 45, 586-588.
- Blau, P. M. The flow of occupational supply and recruitment. American
Sociological Review, 1965, 30, 475-490.
- Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. The American occupational structure.
New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Bloom, R., Whiteman, M., & Deutsch, M. Race and social class as separate
factors related to social environment. American Journal of Sociology,
1965, 70, 471-476.
- Blum, Z. D. White and black careers during the first decade of labor
force experience. Part II: Income differences. Social Science
Research, 1972, 1, 271-292.
- Bradburn, N. M., & Caplovitz, D. Reports on happiness. Chicago:
Aldine, 1965.

- Drake, S. C. The social and economic status of the Negro in the United States. Daedalus, 1965, 94, 771-814.
- Duncan, O. D. Inheritance of poverty or inheritance of race? In D. P. Moynihan (Ed.), On understanding poverty. New York: Basic Books, 1969. Pp. 85-110.
- Duncan, O. D., & Artis, J. W. Some problems of stratification research. Rural Sociology, 1951, 16, 17-29.
- Dwyer, P. S. The determination of the factor loadings of a given test from the known factor loadings of other tests. Psychometrika, 1937, 2, 173-178.
- Fleiss, J. L., Cohen, J., & Everitt, B. S. Large sample standard errors of kappa and weighted kappa. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 72, 323-327.
- The Fortune survey. Fortune, January, 1947, pp. 5-6; 10; 12; 16.
- Foskett, J. M. Social structure and social participation. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 431-438.
- Freeman, H. E., Ross, J. M., Armor, D., & Pettigrew, T. F. Color gradation and attitudes among middle-income Negroes. American Sociological Review, 1966, 31, 365-374.
- Gilmore, H., & Wilson, L. Negro socioeconomic status in a Southern city. Sociology and Social Research, 1945, 29, 361-373.
- Glenn, N. D. Negro prestige criteria: A case study in the bases of prestige. American Journal of Sociology, 1963, 68, 645-657.

- Gordon, M. M. Social class in American sociology. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1958.
- Gough, H. G. A short social status inventory. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1949, 40, 52-56.
- Goyder, J. C., & Pineo, P. C. Minority group status and self-evaluated class. Sociological Quarterly, 1974, 15, 199-211.
- Gurin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. Americans view their mental health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Guttman, L. A revision of Chapin's Social Status scale. American Sociological Review, 1942, 7, 362-369.
- Hadden, J. K., & Borgatta, E. F. American cities--Their social characteristics. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.
- Harman, H. H. Modern factor analysis (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Hendrickson, A. E., & White, P. O. Promax: A quick method for rotation to oblique simple structure. British Journal of Statistical Psychology, 1964, 17, 65-70.
- Hetzler, S. A. An investigation of the distinctiveness of social classes. American Sociological Review, 1953, 18, 493-497.
- Hill, M. C., & McCall, B. C. Social stratification in "Georgia Town." American Sociological Review, 1950, 15, 721-729.
- Hollingshead, A. B. Elmstown's youth. New York: Wiley, 1949.
- Hollingshead, A. B. Two factor index of social position. New Haven, Conn.: Author, 1957.

- Hollingshead, A. B., & Redlich, F. C. Social class and mental illness: A community study. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Horton, J. E., & Thompson, W. E. Powerlessness and political negativism: A study of defeated local referendums. American Journal of Sociology, 1962, 67, 485-493.
- Jackman, M. R., & Jackman, R. W. An interpretation of the relation between objective and subjective social status. American Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 569-582.
- Jackson, E. F., & Curtis, R. F. Conceptualization and measurement in the study of social stratification. In H. M. Blalock, Jr. & A. B. Blalock (Eds.), Methodology in social research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968. Pp. 112-149.
- Jaffe, A. J., & Carleton, R. O. Occupational mobility in the United States, 1930-1960. New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University, 1954.
- Kahl, J. A., & Davis, J. A. A comparison of indexes of socio-economic status. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 317-325.
- Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P. Personal influence. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955.
- Kaufman, H. F. Defining prestige rank in a rural community. Sociometry, 1945, 8, 199-207.
- King, M. B. Socioeconomic status and sociometric choice. Social Forces, 1961, 39, 199-206.
- Knopfer, G. Indices of socio-economic status: A study of some problems of measurement. New York: Author, 1946.

- Landecker, W. S. Class boundaries. American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 868-877.
- Landecker, W. S. Class crystallization and class consciousness. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 219-229.
- Lasswell, T. E. A study of social stratification using an area sample of raters. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 310-313.
- Laumann, E. O. Prestige and association in an urban community--An analysis of an urban stratification system. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.
- Laumann, E. O. Bonds of pluralism: The form and substance of urban social networks. New York: Wiley, 1973.
- Laumann, E. O., & Guttman, L. The relative associational contiguity of occupations in an urban setting. American Sociological Review, 1966, 31, 169-178.
- Leahy, A. M. Measurement of urban home environment: Validation and standardization of the Minnesota Home Status Index. Institute of Child Welfare Monograph Series, 1936 (Whole No. 11).
- Lenski, G. E. American social classes: Statistical strata or social groups? American Journal of Sociology, 1952, 58, 139-144.
- Lenski, G. E. Status crystallization: A non-vertical dimension of social status. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 405-413.
- Lipset, S. M., & Bendix, R. Social mobility in industrial society. Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif.: University of California Press, 1959.

- Loomis, C. P., Beegle, J. A., & Longmore, T. W. Critique of class as related to social stratification. Sociometry, 1947, 10, 319-337.
- Lundberg, G. A., & Steele, M. Social attraction-patterns in a village. Sociometry, 1938, 1, 375-419.
- Marx, K. Capital--A critique of political economy. Vol. 3. The process of capitalist production as a whole. New York: International Publishers, 1967.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. Manifesto of the Communist party. New York: International Publishers, 1932.
- Mayer, K. B., & Buckley, W. Class and society (3rd ed.). New York: Random House, 1970.
- McNemar, Q. On the number of factors. Psychometrika, 1942, 7, 9-18.
- Moore, W. E. But some are more equal than others. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 13-18.
- Morgan, J. N., David, M. H., Cohen, W. J., & Brazer, H. E. Income and welfare in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Murray, W. I. Measuring the social-class status of Negro children in the elementary and high school. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1951, 25, 102-111.
- Nam, C. B., & Powers, M. G. Variations in socioeconomic structure by race, residence, and the life cycle. American Sociological Review, 1965, 30, 97-103.
- National Opinion Research Center. Jobs and occupations: A popular evaluation. Opinion News, 1947, 9 (4), 3-13.

- Park, R. E. The bases of race prejudice. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1928, 140(229), 11-20.
- Parker, S., & Kleiner, R. J. Mental illness in the urban Negro community. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- Pettigrew, T. F. Negro American personality: Why isn't more known? Journal of Social Issues, 1964, 20(2), 4-23.
- Price, J. S. Negro-white differences in general intelligence. Journal of Negro Education, 1934, 3, 424-452.
- Rao, C. R. Advanced statistical methods in biometric research. New York: Wiley, 1952.
- Rennie, D., & Hilgendorf, R. Stratification in a small town. Sociological Quarterly, 1960, 1, 117-128.
- Rogers, G., & Linden, J. D. Use of multiple discriminant function analysis in the evaluation of three multivariate grouping techniques. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1973, 33, 787-802.
- Schmid, C. F., & Nobbe, C. E. Socioeconomic differentials among non-white races. American Sociological Review, 1965, 30, 909-922.
- Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.
- Segal, D. R., & Schaffner, R. Status, party and Negro Americans. Phylon, 1968, 29, 224-230.
- Smith, T. L. The class structure in contemporary society in the USA. Social Science, 1970, 45, 133-142.

- Srole, L. Social integration and certain corollaries: An exploratory study. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 709-716.
- Stricker, L. J. Measuring social status with occupational information: Some useful procedures. (RM 72-9). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, August 1972.
- Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. M. Response effects in surveys. Chicago: Aldine, 1974.
- Svalastoga, K. Social differentiation. New York: McKay, 1965.
- Turner, R. H. Negro job status and education. Social Forces, 1953, 32, 45-52.
- U. S. Bureau of the Budget. Standard metropolitan statistical areas. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1960 census of population, Alphabetical index of occupations and industries. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. census of population: 1960. Number of inhabitants, United States summary. Final Report PC(1)-1A. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961. (a)
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. censuses of population and housing, 1960: Principal data-collection forms and procedures. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961. (b)
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. census of population: 1960. Detailed characteristics, Ohio. Final Report PC(1)-37D. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962. (a)

- U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. censuses of population and housing: 1960. Census tracts. Final report PHC(1)-158. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962. (b)
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. Census of housing: 1970. General housing characteristics. Final report HC(1)-A37 Ohio. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971. (a)
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. Census of population: 1970. General population characteristics. Final report PC(1)-B37 Ohio. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971. (b)
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. Census of population and housing: 1970. Census tracts. Final report PHC(1)-215 Toledo, Ohio-Michigan SMSA. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1972.
- U. S. Bureau of Employment Security. Dictionary of occupational titles. Vol. 1. Definitions of titles (3rd ed.). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.
- Ward, J. H., Jr. Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1963, 58, 236-244.
- Warner, W. L. American caste and class. American Journal of Sociology, 1936, 42, 234-237.
- Warner, W. L., & Low, J. O. The social system of the modern factory. Yankee City series, Vol. 4. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1947.
- Warner, W. L., & Lunt, P. S. The social life of a modern community. Yankee City series, Vol. 1. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1941.

- Warner, W. L., & Lunt, P. S. The status system of a modern community.
Yankee City series, Vol. 2. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University
Press, 1942.
- Warner, W. L., Meeker, M., & Eells, K. Social class in America.
Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949.
- Warner, W. L., & Srole, L. The social systems of American ethnic groups.
Yankee City series, Vol. 3. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University
Press, 1945.
- Weber, M. Class, status, party. In H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills (Eds.),
From Max Weber: Essays in sociology. New York: Oxford University
Press, 1946. Pp. 180-195.
- Weber, M. The theory of social and economic organization. New York:
Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Wheeler, W. Social stratification in a plains community. Minneapolis,
Minn.: Author, 1949.
- Wilks, S. S. Certain generalizations in the analysis of variance.
Biometrika, 1932, 24, 471-494.
- Woodward, J. L., & Roper, E. Research on political parties and leadership.
American Political Science Review, 1950, 44, 872-885.

Footnotes

¹This study was supported in part by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development under Research Grant 1 P01 HD 01762.

Thanks are due David Caplovitz, Otis Dudley Duncan, Norval D. Glenn, and Elton F. Jackson for advice about the research design; Reuben Cohen, Janet Cuca, Elton F. Jackson, and Charlotte Slider for assistance in developing the questionnaire; Howard E. Freeman for providing the skin color chart, and Chester Tanaka for supervising its reproduction; Peter H. Rossi and Gerhard E. Lenski for furnishing the prestige scores for nationalities; Frederick F. Stephan for advice on the sampling; Reuben Cohen for devising the sampling plan and supervising all phases of the field work; Byron Emery for assistance in classifying the racial composition of areas in Lucas County; Darla Felsburg and Charlotte Slider for carrying out the sampling as well as supervising the interviewing; Orley C. Ashenfelter for advice on correcting Hollingshead (1957) and Warner, Meeker, and Eells (1949) scales for inflation; Elton F. Jackson and Charlotte Slider for advice about the editing and coding; Karla S. Goldman for assistance in preparing the editing and coding manuals; and Karla S. Goldman and Edward C. Nystrom for supervising the editing and coding.

Thanks are also due Henrietta Gallagher for supervising the data analysis, and Kathryn M. Kazarow, Brian McNally, and Edward C. Nystrom for carrying it out; John L. Barone for supervising the computer programming, and Alice Gerb, Richard H. Harrison, Kathryn M. Kazarow,

Edward C. Nystrom, Alfred M. Rogers, Keith Soper, and Diane Pasta for doing it; Kenneth A. Carlson, John B. Carroll, Walter Emmerich, Norman Frederiksen, Harry H. Harman, Douglas N. Jackson, Samuel Messick, Martin E. Morf, David R. Owen, Ledyard R. Tucker, Bary Wingersky, and Allen Yates for advice about the factor and cluster analyses; Rosemary A. Little for providing the census material used in the analysis; Charlotte H. Kiefer and Brian McNally for locating the articles cited in this report; and Walter Emmerich, Norman Frederiksen, Elton F. Jackson, Karla S. Goldman, and Barbara Kirsh for critical reviews of a draft of the manuscript.

²A small additional sample was drawn, but not used, consisting of black households with ratings of average or above on the house type scale.

³The criterion was missing or inadequate information on five or more of the following variables: Own Occupation, Own Education, Source of Income, Own Income, Other Family Members' Income, Centers' (1949) Class Identification measure, Chapin's (1935) Social Status scale (original and Guttman, 1942, weights), Interviewer's Rating of House Type, and Interviewer's Rating of Dwelling Area.

⁴The frequency distributions for the samples were compared with each other by χ^2 tests (all of the probability values are two-tailed): Age, χ^2 (4) = 21.34, $p < .01$; Sex, χ^2 (1) = 15.66, $p < .01$; Marital Status, χ^2 (4) = 30.25, $p < .01$; Household Type, χ^2 (11) = 48.78, $p < .01$; Number of Persons in Home, χ^2 (5) = 9.82, $p > .05$; Own or Family Income, χ^2 (8) = 48.08, $p < .01$; Own Current Occupation, including occupation groups only,

χ^2 (8) = 58.42, $p < .01$; Own Current Occupation, including all categories, χ^2 (13) = 76.88, $p < .01$; Own Education, χ^2 (5) = 40.28, $p < .01$; and Interviewer's Rating of Social Class, χ^2 (4) = 46.27, $p < .01$.

⁵The frequency distributions for the samples were compared with the 1960 and 1970 censuses by χ^2 tests (all of the probability values are two-tailed). Age: whites 1960, χ^2 (4) = 11.63, $p < .05$; whites 1970, χ^2 = 5.98, $p > .05$; blacks 1960, χ^2 = 7.47, $p > .05$; and blacks 1970, χ^2 = 3.11, $p > .05$. Sex: whites 1960, χ^2 (1) = .08, $p > .05$; whites 1970, χ^2 = 1.53, $p > .05$; blacks 1960, χ^2 = 7.14, $p < .01$; and blacks 1970, χ^2 = .00, $p > .05$. Number of Persons in Home: whites 1960, χ^2 (5) = 5.41, $p > .05$; whites 1970, χ^2 = 5.59, $p > .05$; blacks 1960, χ^2 = 6.32, $p > .05$; and blacks 1970, χ^2 = 3.07, $p > .05$. Persons per Room: whites 1960, χ^2 (3) = 14.11, $p < .01$; whites 1970, χ^2 = 4.09, $p > .05$; blacks 1960, χ^2 = 19.10, $p < .01$; blacks 1970, χ^2 = 3.00, $p > .05$. Number of Rooms: whites 1960, census data not available; whites 1970, χ^2 (7) = 43.90, $p < .01$; blacks 1960, χ^2 = 19.41, $p < .01$; and blacks 1970, χ^2 = 15.23, $p < .05$. Owner vs. Renter of Home: whites 1960, χ^2 (1) = 9.22, $p < .01$; whites 1970, χ^2 = 12.59, $p < .01$; blacks 1960, χ^2 = 3.18, $p > .05$; and blacks 1970, χ^2 = 4.37, $p < .05$.

⁶Copies of the editing and coding manuals are available from the author.

⁷The questions and ratings were: Do you read any newspapers regularly...?, Which ones? (Q. 4); Do you read any magazines regularly...?,

Which ones? (Q. 5); What clubs or organizations do you belong to?, Do you hold any office or position in this group...?, About how often do you attend meetings of this organization...?, Does this organization... sometimes take a stand on housing or school problems, or other public problems...? (Q. 8 to 11); What country did his [the respondent's father or surrogate father] people originally come from? (Q. 71); What country did her [the respondent's mother or surrogate mother] people originally come from? (Q. 75); Which of these terms describes how you compare to the other people here in the Toledo area in social standing? (Q. 63); Which of these terms describes how you compare to the other people here in the Toledo area in income and wealth? (Q. 96); Which of these terms describes how you compare to the other people here in the Toledo area in power or influence? (Q. 82); People have different ideas of just how they fit into community affairs. Which one of these is the best description of how you fit in? (Q. 64); If you were asked to use one of these four names for your social class, which would you say you belonged in...? (Q. 62); Interviewer's rating of respondent's race (Q. 113); Interviewer's rating of respondent's skin color (Q. 114); and Interviewer's rating of respondent's social class (Q. 115).

⁸Coders of occupation questions were given special training over a two-day period in using Hollingshead, Warner et al., and Centers occupation codes as well as census (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1960) occupation and industry codes. This training also included use of the Alphabetical Index of Occupations and Industries (U. S. Bureau of the

Census, 1960) and the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (U. S. Bureau of Employment Security, 1965). General principles of coding occupation data, special conventions to be followed, and the various coding schemes were discussed. Coders independently coded, with each of the schemes, a large number of answers to occupation questions, obtained from the practice questionnaires, and then discussed the results in a group with a supervisor. This process continued until the coders achieved maximal agreement.

⁹The "Other" cards, containing verbatim answers that did not fit into standard code categories for open ended questions, were tabulated when the coding of a section of the questionnaire was completed. Typically, new code categories were derived if they represented more than 10% of the total answers.

¹⁰A detailed description of the procedures used in obtaining the new variables from the basic coded ones is available from the author.

¹¹Tables containing the means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations of the basic and supplementary variables in each sample, the unrotated first-order factor and transformation matrices for the two, and the coefficients of congruence between their rotated factors are available from the author.

¹²P. H. Rossi, personal communication, June 21, 1973.

¹³Tables containing the unrotated second-order factor and transformation matrices for the two samples are available from the author.

¹⁴Tables containing the unrotated third-order factor and transformation matrices for the two samples are available from the author.

¹⁵A table containing the D^2 matrix based on the respondents' score profiles is available from the author.

¹⁶A table containing the D^2 matrix based on the mean score profiles for the Carlson and Ward clusters is available from the author.

¹⁷The product-moment correlations between the social status variables ranged from .44 to .62, the median being .51; corrected for attenuation, using the variables' communalities as reliability measures, the correlations ranged from .68 to .93, with a median of .74. These corrected correlations are overestimates, because the communalities represent lower bound measures of reliability.

For a random sample of 87 D^2 s from the 225×225 D^2 matrix, drawn with the constraints that each D^2 was based on score profiles with complete data and no profile was used more than once, D^2 had a product-moment correlation of .90 ($p < .01$, two-tailed) with the absolute difference in profile means (i.e., elevation), .14 ($p > .05$, two-tailed) with the absolute difference in profile standard deviations (i.e., scatter), and $-.22$ ($p < .05$, two-tailed) with the product-moment correlation between profiles (i.e., shape).

Table 1
Education of White and Black Family Heads Scaled by
Social Status, 1960 Census

Warner et al. Social Status Category	Education (in years)	Whites (N=107,590)	Blacks (N=9,571)
1,2	13 or more	18.7%	7.0%
3	12	24.9	14.1
4	9-11	23.0	24.5
5	8	17.9	17.4
6,7	Under 8	15.5	37.0
Total		100.0%	100.0%

Note. The source of the data is U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962a, Table 111--Toledo SMSA. The data shown for blacks are actually for nonwhites. The social status categories appear in Warner et al., 1949.

Table 2
Current Occupation of White and Black Family Heads Scaled by
Social Status, 1960 Census

Warner et al. Social Status Category	Major Occupation Group	Whites (N=85,610)	Blacks (N=6,104)
1,2	Professionals, technical, and kindred workers; managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	25.3%	6.7%
3	Clerical and kindred workers; sales workers	16.7	7.0
4	Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	23.8	14.9
6	Operatives and kindred workers; service workers; private household workers	29.9	56.4
7	Laborers, except farm and mine	4.3	15.1
Total		100.0%	100.1%

Note. The source of the data is U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962a, Table 112--Toledo SMSA. The data shown for blacks are actually for non-whites. The social status categories appear in Warner et al., 1949. Their original occupational scale was employed, instead of the revised scale, because of the former's correspondence to the census occupation groups. Current Occupation was No Occupation or Not Reported for 21,255 respondents in the white census and 3,441 in the black census. A total of 725 respondents in the white census and 26 in the black census were either farmers and farm managers or farm laborers and farm foreman, two occupation groups not classifiable by the Warner et al. scheme. No census occupation group corresponded to the Warner et al. category 5, which consists of proprietors of small businesses. Although private household workers correspond to the Warner et al. category 7, they are included in category 6 in this table because the census data combine private household workers with service workers, and the latter pre-dominate and belong in category 6. Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of rounding errors.

Table 3

Age of the Interviewer

Age (in years)	Whites	Blacks
	(N=17)	(N=18)
Under 25	47.1%	22.2%
25-34	11.8	38.9
35-44	23.5	11.1
45 and over	17.6	27.8
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Note. Interviewer: Age was Not Ascertained for
an additional 3 white and 5 black
interviewers.

Table 4
Education of the Interviewers

Education (in years)	Whites	Blacks
	(N=20)	(N=21)
Under 12	10.0%	4.8%
12	30.0	52.4
13-15	35.0	38.1
16 or more	25.0	4.8
Total	100.0%	100.1%

Note. Interviewer: Education was Not Ascertained for an additional 2 black interviewers. Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of rounding errors.

Table 5

Disposition of All Designated Households in the Samples

Disposition	Whites										Blacks									
	Lister's Rating of House Type										Lister's Rating of House Type									
	Upper		Middle		Lower		Total		Upper		Middle		Lower		Total		Upper		Middle	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Deleted																				
Interviewer irregularity	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	4	100.0	17	94.4	70	100.0	91	98.9				
Assignment card not returned by interviewer	3	75.0	4	66.7	3	100.0	10	76.9	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0				
Duplicate household added by error	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	5.6	0	.0	1	1.1				
Household added by error	1	25.0	2	33.3	0	.0	3	23.1	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0				
Total	4	100.0	6	100.0	3	100.0	13	100.0	4	100.0	18	100.0	70	100.0	92	100.0				
Ineligible																				
Vacant	2	50.0	6	54.5	1	20.0	9	45.0	0	.0	1	14.3	21	25.0	22	22.9				
Nonexistent	0	.0	1	9.1	1	20.0	2	10.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	1.2	1	1.0				
Other--reason unspecified	1	25.0	2	18.2	1	20.0	4	20.0	0	.0	0	.0	9	10.7	9	9.4				
White in black sample not added to white sample	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	5	100.0	6	85.7	41	48.8	52	54.2				
Person other than white or black	0	.0	0	.0	1	20.0	1	5.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	1.2	1	1.0				
Initial race not ascertainable	0	.0	1	9.1	1	20.0	2	10.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0				
White drawn by error as replacement in black sample	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	1.2	1	1.0				
Other race drawn by error for black sample	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	1.2	1	1.0				
Vacant unit drawn by error for sample	1	25.0	1	9.1	0	.0	2	10.0	0	.0	0	.0	9	10.7	9	9.4				
Total	4	100.0	11	100.0	5	100.0	20	100.0	5	100.0	7	100.0	84	100.0	96	99.9				
Eligible																				
Completed interview	65	86.7	98	79.0	60	74.1	225 ^a	79.8	8	66.7	42	75.0	156	81.2	206	79.2				
Refused	8	10.7	11	8.9	9	11.1	28	9.9	3	25.0	11	19.6	22	11.5	36	13.8				
Ill	1	1.3	9	7.3	4	4.9	14	5.0	0	.0	0	.0	3	1.6	3	1.2				
Never at home	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	1.8	4	2.1	5	1.9				
Moved	1	1.3	3	2.4	3	3.7	7	2.5	0	.0	0	.0	5	2.6	5	1.9				
Language barrier	0	.0	1	.8	3	3.7	4	1.4	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0				
Invalid interview	0	.0	0	.0	1	1.2	1	.4	1	8.3	1	1.8	0	.0	2	.8				
Other	0	.0	2	1.6	1	1.2	3	1.1	0	.0	1	1.8	2	1.0	3	1.2				
Total	75	100.0	124	100.0	81	99.9	282	100.1	12	100.0	56	100.0	192	100.0	260	100.0				
Grand Total	83	--	141	--	89	--	315	--	21	--	81	--	346	--	448	--				

Note. Lister's Rating of House Type was collapsed as follows: upper ("excellent dwellings," "very good dwellings," and "good" dwellings"), middle ("average dwellings"), and lower ("fair dwellings," "poor dwellings," and "very poor dwellings").

^aLister's Rating of House Type was Not Ascertained for 2 households.

Table 6
Number of Households with Certain Dispositions per Location in the Samples

Disposition	Basic White Locations			Supplementary White Locations			Nonwhite Locations			Total						
	Households			Households			Households			Households						
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.				
Whites																
Designated (after deletions)	128	268	2.09	1.09	0	--	--	33	34	1.03	.17	161	302	1.88	1.07	
Eligible	126	252	2.00	1.06	0	0	--	29	30	1.03	.19	155	282	1.82	1.03	
Completed interview	122	208	1.70	1.02	0	0	--	17	17	1.00	.00	139	225	1.62	.98	
Blacks																
Designated (after deletions)	7	13	1.86	1.86	9	31	3.44	1.01	131	312	2.38	1.21	147	356	2.42	1.26
Eligible	4	8	2.00	2.00	6	13	2.17	1.17	118	239	2.03	1.01	128	260	2.03	1.04
Completed interview	3	5	1.67	1.15	6	11	1.83	1.17	108	190	1.76	.87	117	206	1.76	.89

Table 7

Age of the Samples

Age (in years)	Whites	Blacks
	(N=221)	(N=205)
14-24	5.0%	8.8%
25-34	14.9	18.5
35-44	14.0	25.9
45-64	40.7	34.6
65 and over	25.3	12.2
Total	99.9%	100.0%

Note. Age was Don't Know or Not Ascertained
for an additional 4 respondents in the
white sample and 1 in the black sample.
Percentages do not add up to 100.0%
because of rounding errors.

Table 10

Household Type of the Samples

Household Type	Whites (N=224)	Blacks (N=205)
Husband and wife		
Children, other relatives, nonrelatives	.0%	.0%
Children, other relatives, no nonrelatives	1.3	1.5
Children, no other relatives, nonrelatives	.0	.0
Children, no other relatives, no nonrelatives	46.4	33.7
No children, other relatives, nonrelatives	.0	.0
No children, other relatives, no nonrelatives	.4	3.9
No children, no other relatives, nonrelatives	.4	2.0
No children, no other relatives, no nonrelatives	28.1	15.1
No Spouse		
Children, other relatives, nonrelatives	.4	.0
Children, other relatives, no nonrelatives	.9	3.4
Children, no other relatives, nonrelatives	.0	.5
Children, no other relatives, no nonrelatives	3.6	16.1
No children, other relatives, nonrelatives	.0	.0
No children, other relatives, no nonrelatives	1.3	3.9
No children, no other relatives, nonrelatives	.9	2.9
No children, no other relatives, no nonrelatives	16.1	17.1
Total	99.8%	100.1%

Note. Household Type was Don't Know or Not Ascertained for an additional 1 respondent in the white sample and 1 in the black sample. Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of rounding errors.

Table 11

Number of Persons in Home of the Samples

Number of Persons	Whites	Blacks
	(N=224)	(N=205)
1	16.1%	17.1%
2	32.6	27.3
3	13.4	19.5
4	18.8	11.2
5	8.0	8.3
6 or more	11.2	16.6
Total	100.1%	100.0%

Note. Number of Persons in Home was Don't Know or
Not Ascertained for an additional 1 respondent
in the white sample and 1 in the black sample.

Table 12

Own or Family Income of the Samples

Income (in dollars)	Whites	Blacks
	(N=194)	(N=172)
Under 2,000	7.2%	24.4%
2,000-3,999	10.3	19.2
4,000-5,999	9.3	14.0
6,000-7,999	19.1	15.1
8,000-9,999	12.4	12.2
10,000-11,999	12.4	5.8
12,000-14,999	15.5	4.1
15,000-24,999	10.8	4.1
25,000 and over	3.1	1.2
Total	100.1%	100.1%

Note. Own or Family Income was Don't Know or Not
Ascertained for an additional 31 respondents
in the white sample and 34 in the black sample.
Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of
rounding errors.

Table 13

Own Current Occupation of the Samples

Major Occupation Group	Whites (N=203)	Blacks (N=192)
Occupation		
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	9.9%	4.2%
Farmers and farm managers	.0	.0
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	15.3	2.6
Clerical and kindred workers	7.4	2.6
Sales workers	4.4	1.0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	14.3	7.3
Operatives and kindred workers	14.8	21.9
Private household workers	.0	6.2
Service workers, except private household	4.9	13.0
Farm laborers and foremen	.0	.0
Laborers, except farm and mine	3.4	6.2
No Occupation		
Unemployed	2.0	10.4
Retired	17.2	14.6
Full-time housewife	5.9	6.2
Disabled	.0	2.6
Never worked	.5	1.0
Total	100.0%	99.8%

Note. Own Current Occupation was Don't Know or Not Ascertained for an additional 22 respondents in the white sample and 14 in the black sample. Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of rounding errors.

Table 14

Own Education of the Samples

Education (in years)	Whites	Blacks
	(N=222)	(N=190)
Under 8	8.6%	26.8%
8	14.0	12.6
9-11	17.6	26.8
12	35.6	22.1
13-15	11.7	6.8
16 or more	12.6	4.7
Total	100.1%	99.8%

Note. Own Education was Don't Know or Not Ascertained for an additional 3 respondents in the white sample and 16 in the black sample. Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of rounding errors.

Table 15

Interviewer's Rating of Social Class of the Samples

Rating	Whites	Blacks
	(N=223)	(N=203)
Upper	2.7%	.5%
Upper middle	40.4	19.2
Lower middle	42.2	39.4
Upper lower	13.5	34.5
Lower lower	1.3	6.4
Total	100.1%	100.0%

Note. Interviewer's Rating of Social Class was Not
Ascertained for an additional 2 respondents in
the white sample and 3 in the black sample.
Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of
rounding errors.

Table 16

Comparisons of Age of the Samples with the 1960 and 1970 Censuses

Age (in years)	Whites			Blacks		
	Sample	Census		Sample	Census	
		1960	1970		1960	1970
	(N=221)	(N=127,651)	(N=137,681)	(N=205)	(N=11,279)	(N=15,573)
14-24	5.0%	4.4%	7.3%	8.8%	5.1%	9.3%
25-34	14.9	17.6	17.0	18.5	22.4	20.5
35-44	14.0	21.1	17.2	25.9	25.9	21.3
45-64	40.7	38.1	37.3	34.6	36.2	34.5
65 and over	25.3	18.8	21.2	12.2	10.5	14.4
Total	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%

Note. The sources of the census data are U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962a, Table 106--Toledo SMSA; 1971b, Table 36--Lucas County. The 1960 census data shown for blacks are actually for nonwhites. Age was Don't Know or Not Ascertained for an additional 4 respondents in the white sample and 1 in the black sample. Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of rounding errors.

Table 17

Comparisons of Sex of the Samples with the 1960 and 1970 Censuses

Sex	Whites			Blacks		
	Sample	Census		Sample	Census	
		1960	1970		1960	1970
	(N=225)	(N=127,651)	(N=137,681)	(N=206)	(N=11,279)	(N=15,573)
Male	82.2%	82.9%	78.9%	65.5%	73.8%	65.5%
Female	17.8	17.1	21.1	34.5	26.2	34.5
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. The sources of the census data are U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962a, Table 106--Toledo SMSA; 1971b, Table 36--Lucas County. The 1960 census data shown for blacks are actually for nonwhites.

Table 18

Comparisons of Number of Persons in Home of the Samples with
the 1960 and 1970 Censuses

Number of Persons	Whites			Blacks		
	Sample	Census		Sample	Census	
		1960	1970		1960	1970
	(N=224)	(N=127,692)	(N=138,316)	(N=205)	(N=11,238)	(N=15,573)
1	16.1%	14.6%	19.0%	17.1%	13.6%	19.3%
2	32.6	30.2	30.4	27.3	24.4	24.3
3	13.4	17.7	16.2	19.5	17.4	16.6
4	18.8	16.8	14.8	11.2	13.9	12.6
5	8.0	10.7	9.5	8.3	9.8	9.6
6 or more	11.2	10.0	10.0	16.6	20.9	17.6
Total	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. The sources of the census data are U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b, Tables H1 and H3--Lucas County; 1971a, Tables 14 and 17--Lucas County. The 1960 census data shown for blacks are actually for nonwhites. Number of Persons in Home was Don't Know or Not Ascertained for an additional 1 respondent in the white sample and 1 in the black sample. Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of rounding errors.

Table 19
Comparisons of Persons per Room of the Samples with
the 1960 and 1970 Censuses

Persons per Room	Whites			Blacks		
	Sample	Census		Sample	Census	
		1960	1970		1960	1970
	(N=223)	(N=127,652)	(N=138,316)	(N=204)	(N=11,238)	(N=15,573)
.50 or less	60.5%	49.5%	55.8%	53.9%	39.4%	48.6%
.51-.75	21.5	22.7	21.6	16.7	20.6	20.9
.76-1.00	12.6	21.3	17.5	19.1	22.6	19.3
1.01 or more	5.4	6.5	5.1	10.3	17.4	11.1
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%

Note. The sources of the census data are U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b, Tables H1 and H3--Lucas County; 1971a, Tables 14 and 17--Lucas County. The 1960 census data shown for blacks are actually for nonwhites. Persons per Room was Don't Know or Not Ascertained for an additional 2 respondents in the white sample and 2 in the black sample. Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of rounding errors.

Table 20

Comparisons of Number of Rooms in Home of the Samples with
the 1960 and 1970 Censuses

Number of Rooms	Whites		Blacks		
	Sample	Census	Sample	Census	
		1970		1960	1970
	(N=224)	(N=138,316)	(N=205)	(N=11,238)	(N=15,573)
1	.0%	1.0%	.0%	1.9%	1.0%
2	.4	2.0	1.5	3.9	2.7
3	3.6	7.3	10.2	12.5	10.8
4	10.3	15.0	18.0	14.6	13.2
5	20.5	27.3	24.4	23.9	24.9
6	32.6	27.2	22.0	22.0	24.2
7	14.7	11.8	8.3	11.7	12.7
8 or more	17.9	8.4	15.6	9.5	10.6
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%

Note. The sources of the census data are U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b, Table H3--Lucas County; 1971a, Tables 14 and 17--Lucas County. The 1960 census data for whites were not available. The 1960 census data shown for blacks are actually for nonwhites. Number of Rooms was Don't Know or Not Ascertained for an additional 1 respondent in the white sample and 1 in the black sample. Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of rounding errors.

Table 21

Comparisons of Owner vs. Renter Occupancy of Homes of the Samples
with the 1960 and 1970 Censuses

Occupancy	Whites			Blacks		
	Sample	Census		Sample	Census	
		1960	1970		1960	1970
	(N=205)	(N=127,692)	(138,316)	(N=176)	(N=11,238)	(N=15,573)
Owner	82.0%	72.5%	70.7%	40.3%	47.1%	48.3%
Renter	18.0	27.5	29.3	59.7	52.9	51.7
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. The sources of the census data are U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b, Table H1--Lucas County; 1971a, Tables 14 and 17--Lucas County. The 1960 census data shown for blacks are actually for nonwhites. Owner vs. Renter of Home was Don't Know or Not Ascertained for an additional 20 respondents in the white sample and 30 in the black sample.

Table 22
Length of Interview

Length (in minutes)	Whites	Blacks
	(N=224)	(N=205)
Under 60	.9%	1.5%
60-89	28.1	42.0
90-119	52.7	42.4
120-149	14.3	12.2
150 and over	4.0	2.0
Total	100.0%	100.1%

Note. Length of Interview was Not Ascertained for an additional 1 respondent in the white sample and 1 in the black sample. Percentages do not add up to 100.0% because of rounding errors.

Table 23

Basic Variables and Their Sources

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
Social Status		
Self-report of comparative social standing	--	63
Interviewer's rating of social class	Artz et al., 1971.	115
Own occupation--Duncan	Artz et al., 1971; response scaled by Duncan's, 1961a, 1961b, socioeconomic index, as adapted by Stricker, 1972.	19, 20, 21, or 38
Own education--years	Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	32a
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	117
Protestant religious preference	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	83
Sex is male	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965; and Caplovitz, 1963.	2a
Age--years	--	66
Main support's occupation--Duncan	Gurin et al., 1960; and Parker and Kleiner, 1966; response scaled by Duncan's 1961a, 1961b, socioeconomic index, as adapted by Stricker, 1972.	69; 72 or 76
Main support's education--years	Gurin et al., 1960; and Artz et al., 1971.	69; 73 or 77
Friend's occupation--Duncan	Artz et al., 1971; response scaled by Duncan's, 1961a, 1961b, socioeconomic index, as adapted by Stricker, 1972.	13

Table 23 (Continued)

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating and Its Scoring, if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
Wealth		
Self-report of comparative income and wealth	--	96
Source of income	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965; response scaled by Warner et al.'s, 1949, procedure.	99
Own income--in 1000's	Artz et al., 1971.	100
Family savings	Caplovitz, 1963; and Morgan et al., 1962.	97a
Family debts	Caplovitz, 1963.	98
Power		
Self-report of comparative influence and power	--	82
Decision maker in community affairs	Horton and Thompson, 1962.	64
Takes active part in local issues	Dahl, 1961; and Foskett, 1955.	91
People ask for his/her opinions	Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955.	90
Thinks public officials care about him/her	Campbell et al., 1954.	87
Number of officials or politicians he/she has met	--	88
Had contact with officials or politicians about something he/she wanted	Dahl, 1961.	89a
Number of organization memberships	Artz et al., 1971.	8
Number of leadership positions in organizations	Artz et al., 1971.	9

Table 23 (Continued)

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating and Its Scoring, if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
Number of organizations that takes stands on public issues	Woodward and Roper, 1950.	11
Own occupation--Centers' power	Artz et al., 1971; response scaled by Centers', 1949, power procedure.	19, 20, or 21
Number of employees supervised	Artz et al., 1971; and Gurin et al., 1960.	24b or 24d-24g
Class Consciousness		
Centers' Class Identification measure	Centers, 1949.	62a
Thinks of self as being in a social class	Campbell et al., 1960.	42
Believes there are two or more classes	Kahl and Davis, 1955.	41
Says workers like unions, and businessmen do not	Centers, 1953; Landecker, 1963.	52
Belongs to a union	Artz et al., 1971.	8
Republican political party preference	Campbell et al., 1954.	85
Psychological Gratification		
Happiness	Gurin et al., 1960.	61
Extent of success in life	Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	80
Current or last job: Satisfaction	Gurin et al., 1960.	25

Table 23 (Continued)

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating and Its Source, if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
Home and Possessions		
Possessions	Gough, 1949; and Leahy, 1936.	92--Hi-fi or Stereo Phonograph, Musical Instrument, Typewriter, Encyclopedia, Automobile, Camera
Number of newspapers	Caplovitz, 1963.	4
Number of magazines	Caplovitz, 1963.	5
Food expenditures	Caplovitz, 1963.	95
Housing expenditures	Morgan et al., 1962.	107b-107e, 108, or 109b-109e
Rent--actual or estimated	Morgan et al., 1962.	107a, 108a, or 109f
Persons per room	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965; Caplovitz, 1963; and Morgan, 1962; responses combined by U.S. Bureau of the Census's, 1962b, procedure.	2a; 104
Owner vs. renter of home	Morgan et al., 1962.	105
Interviewer's rating of house type	Warner et al., 1949.	123
Self-report of comparative neighborhood quality	Artz et al., 1971.	110
Interviewer's rating of dwelling area	Warner et al., 1949.	124
Census: Median house value for census tract	U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b.	--

Table 23 (Continued)

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating and Its Source, if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
Census: Median rent for census tract	U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b.	--
Census: Percent deteriorating and dilapidated housing for census tract	U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962b.	--
Life Chances and Life Styles		
Number of times unemployed	Morgan et al., 1962.	17
Number of spare time activities	Artz et al., 1971; and Gurin et al., 1960	3
Interviewer's rating of grammar	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	119
Attitudes and Values		
Anomie	Srole, 1956; question selected on basis of Neal and Rettig, 1963; and Struening and Richardson, 1965.	51
Authoritarianism	Adorno et al., 1950; question selected on basis of Krug, 1961; and Struening and Richardson, 1965.	50
Congenial vs. economic considerations in choosing a job	National Opinion Research Center, 1947; and Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	30
Personal vs. impersonal factors in getting ahead on a job	Artz et al., 1971; and The Fortune Survey, 1947.	31
Personal vs. impersonal things affecting success	Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	81

Table 24

Supplementary Variables and Their Sources

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating and Its Scoring, if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
Social Status		
Own nationality--Lanski	Artz et al., 1971; responses scaled and combined by Lenski's, 1954, procedure.	71, 75
Own nationality--Rossi	Artz et al., 1971; responses scaled by Rossi's, Personal Communication--June 21, 1973, procedure and combined by Lenski's, 1954, procedure.	71, 75
Race is black	Gurin et al., 1960.	113
Interviewer's rating of skin color	Freeman et al., 1966.	114
Main support's nationality--Rossi	Artz et al., 1971; responses scaled by Rossi's, Personal Communication--June 21, 1973, procedure.	69; 71 or 75
Wealth		
Other family members' income--in 1000's	--	103
(Own or family income--in 1000's)	Artz et al., 1971.	100, 103
Power		
(Number of successful contacts with officials or politicians)	Dahl, 1961.	89
(Number of all contacts with officials or politicians)	Dahl, 1961.	89

Table 24 (Continued)

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating and Its Scoring, if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
Class Consciousness		
Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale--revised	Centers, 1949.	43-48
Home and Possessions		
Chapin's Social Status scale--original weights	Caplovitz, 1963; and Chapin, 1935; responses scored by Chapin's, 1935, procedure.	4; 5; 92--Bookcase with Books in It--How many?, Telephone; 92--Black and White TV, Color TV, or Radio; 120.
Chapin's Social Status scale--Guttman weights	Caplovitz, 1963; and Chapin, 1935; responses scored by Guttman's, 1942, procedure.	4; 5; 92--Bookcase with Books in It--How many?, Telephone; 92--Black and White TV, Color TV, or Radio; 120
(Rent--actual or estimated--per room)	Morgan et al., 1962.	104; 107a, 108a, or 109f
(Number of rooms)	Morgan et al., 1962.	104
(Lister's rating of house type)	Warner et al., 1949.	Cover Page--Rating:Area
Interviewer's rating of building type--private home	Morgan et al., 1962.	122a
Interviewer's rating of building condition	Deutsch, 1967.	121
(Lister's rating of dwelling area)	Warner et al., 1949.	Cover Page--Rating:HU
Neighbor's occupation--Duncan	Response scaled by Duncan's, 1961a, 1961b, socioeconomic index, as adapted by Stricker, 1972.	111

Table 24 (Continued)

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
Composite Indexes		
(Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position)	Artz et al., 1971; and Parker and Kleiner, 1966; responses scaled and combined by Hollingshead's 1957, procedure.	19 or 20; 32a
(Warner et al.'s Index of Status Characteristics)	Artz et al., 1971; Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965; and Warner et al., 1949; responses scaled and combined by Warner et al.'s, 1949, procedure.	19, 20, 21, or 38; 99; 123; 124
Background and Family Situation		
Raised in broken home	Gurin et al., 1960	69a
Main support was man	Gurin et al., 1960.	69
Main support's birthplace	Artz et al., 1971; and Gurin et al., 1960.	69; 70 or 74
Number of all siblings	Artz et al., 1971; responses combined by Blau and Duncan's, 1967, procedure.	78, 79
Own birthplace	Gurin et al., 1960.	65
Size of community where raised	Artz et al., 1971.	67
Length of time in Toledo	Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	68
Marital status--married	Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	35a
Spouse had income	--	103
Broken family	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965; and Caplovitz, 1963.	2a
Extended family	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965; and Caplovitz, 1963.	2a
Nonrelatives in home	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965; and Caplovitz, 1963.	2a

Table 24 (Continued)

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
(Number in nuclear family in home)	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965; and Caplovitz, 1963.	2a
(Number in total family in home)	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965; and Caplovitz, 1963.	2a
(Number of persons in home)	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965; and Caplovitz, 1963; responses combined by U.S. Bureau of the Census's, 1962b, procedure.	2a
Child Rearing		
Physically punishes child	--	53
Permits child's aggression towards parent	Sears et al., 1957.	54
Buying Behavior		
Buys on installment plan	--	93
Life insurance policy size	Caplovitz, 1963.	94
Leisure Time Activities		
(Spare time activities: Radio and television)	Artz et al., 1971; Gurin et al., 1960.	3
(Spare time activities: Active sports and recreation)	Artz et al., 1971; Gurin et al., 1960.	3
Activities in past week: Went to a bar	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	7--Went to a Bar
Activities in past week: Worked on car	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	7--Worked on Car
Activities in past week: Read Bible	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	7--Read Bible
Activities in past week: Sang or played instrument	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	7--Sang or Played Instrument

Table 24 (Continued)

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating and Its Scoring, if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
Number of visits with friends	Artz et al., 1971.	12
Attendance at organization meetings	Artz et al., 1971.	10
Number of favorite television programs	--	6
Type of favorite television programs: Comedy	--	6
Type of favorite television programs: Current affairs and news	--	6
Type of favorite television programs: Movies	--	6
Type of favorite television programs: Sports	--	6
Occupationally Related Issues		
First job--Duncan	Artz et al., 1971; response scaled by Duncan's, 1961a, 1961b, socioeconomic index, as adapted by Stricker, 1972.	14
Age at first job	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	15
Number of jobs held	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	16
Currently employed full time	Artz et al., 1971.	18
Current or last job: Self-employed vs. works for someone else	Gurin et al., 1960.	24a
Current or last job: Length of time employed	Morgan et al., 1962.	23
Current or last job: Chances of advancement	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	27
Current or last job: Extent of skill and talent used	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	26

Table 24 (Continued)

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
Aspirations		
Preferred job for self--Duncan	Artz et al., 1971; response scaled by Duncan's, 1961a, 1961b, socioeconomic index, as adapted by Stricker, 1972.	28
Educational aspiration for self--years	Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	33
Occupational aspiration for son--Duncan	Parker and Kleiner, 1966; response scaled by Duncan's, 1961a, 1961b, socioeconomic index, as adapted by Stricker, 1972.	29
Educational aspiration for son--years	Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	34
Expected changes in future income	Caplovitz, 1963.	102
Mobility and Inconsistency in Status		
(Blau and Duncan's Intergeneration Occupational Mobility score)	Artz et al., 1971; responses scaled by Duncan's 1961a, 1961b, socioeconomic index, as adapted by Stricker, 1972, and combined by Blau and Duncan's, 1967, procedure.	14; 19, 20, or 21
(Blau and Duncan's Intergeneration Occupational Mobility score)	Artz et al., 1971; Gurin et al., 1960; and Parker and Kleiner, 1966; responses scaled by Duncan's 1961a, 1961b, socioeconomic index, as adapted by Stricker, 1972, and combined by Blau and Duncan's, 1967, procedure.	19; 20 or 21; 69; 72 or 76
(Intergeneration educational mobility)	Artz et al., 1971; Gurin et al., 1960; and Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	32a; 69; 73 or 77
Intrageration income mobility	Caplovitz, 1963.	101
(Lanski's Index of Status Crystallization)	Artz et al., 1971; and Parker and Kleiner, 1966; responses scaled and combined by Lenski's, 1954, procedure.	19 or 20, 32a, 71 or 75, 100

Table 24 (Continued)

Variable	Source of Main Question of Rating and Its Scoring, if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
(Laumann's Index of Associational Status Congruence)	Artz et al., 1971; and Parker and Kleiner, 1966; responses scaled by Duncan's, 1961a, 1961b, socioeconomic index, as adapted by Stricker, 1972, and combined by Laumann's, 1966, procedure.	13; 19, 20, or 21; 72; 111
Impulse Expression		
Present vs. future orientation	National Opinion Research Center cited in Erskine, 1964.	49
Chooses immediate vs. delayed gratification in spending windfall	Caplovitz, 1963; and Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	112
Politics and Religion		
Voting frequency in elections	Campbell et al., 1960.	86
Religious interest	Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965.	84
Interview and Interviewer		
Date of interview	Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	Cover Page--Date
Length of interview	Parker and Kleiner, 1966.	Cover Page--Time Interview Began/Time Interview Ended
Interview reassigned	--	--
Interview validated	--	Cover Page--Validation Check
Interviewer: Sex is male	--	--
Interviewer: Age	--	--
Interviewer: Education	--	--

Table 24 (Continued)

Variable	Source of Main Question or Rating and Its Scoring, if Not Original	Main Question or Rating Number
Interviewer's rating of frankness	Artz et al., 1971.	118
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale--revised	Crowne and Marlowe, 1960; questions selected on basis of Goldfried, 1964.	55-60

Note. Variables that are algebraically or experimentally dependent on basic variables are shown in parentheses.

Table 25

Psychometric Properties of Basic Variables

Variable	Number of Substantive Scores		Percentage of Coder Disagreements		Intraclass Correlation between Coders				Percentage of Editing Discrepancies	
					Whites		Blacks			
	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks	N	l ation	N	l ation	Whites	Blacks
Self-report of comparative social standing	214	201	.9	.5	213	1.00	201	1.00	.0	.0
Interviewer's rating of social class	223	203	.4	.0	223	1.00	203	1.00	.0	.0
Own occupation--Duncan	197	183	21.8	13.1	210	.91	196	.92	5.8	3.9
Own education--years	222	190	2.2	2.4	222	.98	190	1.00	.0	.0
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	222	206	.0	.0	222	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0
Protestant religious preference	225	203	1.8	.5	224	.97	203	.97	.0	.0
Sex is male	225	206	.4	1.9	225	.98	206	.96	.0	.0
Age--years	221	205	.0	.5	223	1.00	205	1.00	.9	.0
Main support's occupation--Duncan	194	172	14.7	15.0	197	.95	172	.96	.0	1.5
Main support's education--years	163	146	5.8	2.9	163	.94	146	1.00	.0	.0
Friend's occupation--Duncan	202	175	20.9	16.5	203	.93	177	.97	1.3	1.5
Self-report of comparative income and wealth	217	204	.0	.0	217	1.00	204	1.00	.0	.0
Source of income	187	150	.9	1.0	188	1.00	150	1.00	.9	.0
Own income--in 1000's	204	186	1.3	2.4	203	1.00	184	1.00	.0	.5

Table 25 (Continued)

Variable	Number of Substantive Scores		Percentage of Coder Disagreements		Intraclass Correlation between Coders				Percentage of Editing Discrepancies	
					Whites		Blacks			
	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks	N	Corre- lation	N	Corre- lation	Whites	Blacks
Family savings	214	202	.0	.0	214	1.00	202	1.00	.0	.0
Family debts	215	197	1.3	1.0	216	.75	197	1.00	.0	.0
Self-report of comparative influence and power	214	205	.9	.0	214	1.00	205	1.00	.0	.0
Decision maker in community affairs	225	202	.0	.0	225	1.00	202	1.00	.0	.0
Takes active part in local issues	222	203	.9	1.0	223	.98	204	.96	.0	.0
People ask for his/her opinions	225	206	.4	.0	225	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0
Thinks public officials care about him/her	217	203	.9	.0	217	.99	203	1.00	.0	.0
Number of officials or politicians he/she has met	214	198	1.3	1.0	214	1.00	198	1.00	.0	.0
Had contact with officials or politicians about something he/she wanted	225	205	.0	.0	225	1.00	205	1.00	.0	.0
Number of organization memberships	211	200	.4	2.4	225	1.00	205	.99	5.3	1.9
Number of leadership positions in organizations	210	199	.4	.5	225	.99	204	1.00	6.7	2.4
Number of organizations that takes stands on public issues	206	192	1.3	1.9	221	.99	198	.99	7.1	2.9
Own occupation--Centers' power	201	193	7.6	3.9	213	.93	199	.92	5.3	3.4
Number of employees supervised	191	171	2.7	1.0	196	1.00	175	1.00	3.6	2.4
Centers' Class Identification measure	223	205	.0	.0	223	1.00	205	1.00	.0	.0

Table 25 (Continued)

Variable	Number of Substantive Scores		Percentage of Coder Disagreements		Intraclass Correlation between Coders						Percentage of Editing Discrepancies	
					Whites		Blacks		Corre- lation			
	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks	N	l r i o n	N	l r i o n	Whites	Blacks		
Thinks of self as being in a social class	222	196	.0	.0	222	1.00	196	1.00	.0	.0		
Believes there are two or more classes	180	169	4.9	4.8	176	1.00	167	1.00	.0	.0		
Says workers like unions, and businessmen do not	218	200	.9	.0	218	1.00	200	1.00	.0	.0		
Belongs to a union	211	200	2.2	1.5	225	.94	205	.96	5.8	1.9		
Republican political party preference	201	186	.4	1.0	201	.99	186	1.00	.0	.0		
Happiness	223	205	.0	.0	223	1.00	205	1.00	.0	.0		
Extent of success in life	222	206	.0	.0	222	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0		
Current or last job: Satisfaction	207	188	.4	.0	214	1.00	195	1.00	3.6	3.4		
Possessions	224	200	.4	2.9	225	1.00	202	1.00	.0	.5		
Number of newspapers	221	203	2.7	1.9	225	.99	206	.99	1.8	1.5		
Number of magazines	215	202	4.4	1.5	223	1.00	205	.92	3.6	1.5		
Food expenditures	221	204	1.3	1.0	221	1.00	204	1.00	.4	.0		
Housing expenditures	188	149	5.3	6.8	200	.95	153	.98	6.7	3.9		
Rent--actual or estimated	194	170	1.3	1.9	205	1.00	176	1.00	5.8	4.4		
Persons per room	223	204	.9	.5	223	1.00	204	1.00	.4	.0		
Owner vs. renter of home	205	176	.0	.0	219	1.00	185	1.00	6.2	4.4		

Table 25 (Continued)

Variable	Number of Substantive Scores	Percentage of Coder Disagreements	Intraclass Correlation between Coders				Percentage of Editing Discrepancies			
			Whites		Blacks		Whites	Blacks		
			N	lotion	N	lotion				
Interviewer's rating of house type	193	190	.0	.0	193	1.00	190	1.00	.0	.0
Self-report of comparative neighborhood quality	219	203	.0	.0	219	1.00	203	1.00	.0	.0
Interviewer's rating of dwelling area	224	206	.9	.0	223	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0
Census: Median house value for census tract	225	206	.4	.0	225	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0
Census: Median rent for census tract	225	206	.4	1.0	225	.99	206	.62	.0	.0
Census: Percent deteriorating and dilapidated housing for census tract	225	206	.0	1.0	225	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0
Number of times unemployed	220	197	.9	2.4	218	1.00	197	.99	.0	.0
Number of spare time activities	202	194	20.0	13.1	222	.94	204	.95	9.3	5.3
Interviewer's rating of grammar	224	201	.0	.0	224	1.00	201	1.00	.0	.0
Anomie	224	206	.0	.0	224	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0
Authoritarianism	218	205	.9	1.0	218	1.00	205	1.00	.0	.0
Congenial vs. economic considerations in choosing a job	224	200	.0	1.0	224	1.00	204	.98	.0	1.9
Personal vs. impersonal factors in getting ahead on a job	219	203	.0	1.0	221	1.00	202	1.00	.9	.0
Personal vs. impersonal things affecting success	215	200	.9	1.9	215	.98	200	.96	.0	.0

Note. All of the intraclass correlations are significant at the .01 level (one-tailed).

Table 26
Psychometric Properties of Supplementary Variables

Variable	Number of Substantive Scores		Percentage of Coder Disagreements		Intraclass Correlation between Coders				Percentage of Editing Discrepancies		
					Whites		Blacks				
	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks	N	lation	Corre-	Blacks	Corre-	Whites	Blacks
Own nationality--Lanski	173	206	4.4	.0	171	1.00	206	.00	.0	.0	.0
Own nationality--Rossi	176	206	4.0	.0	175	1.00	206	.00	.0	.0	.0
Race is black	225	206	.0	.0	225	.00	206	.00	.0	.0	.0
Interviewer's rating of skin color	225	205	.0	.0	225	.00	205	1.00	.0	.0	.0
Main support's nationality--Rossi	192	206	2.7	.0	189	1.00	206	.00	.0	.0	.0
Other family members' income--in 1000's	211	186	2.2	2.9	209	1.00	183	1.00	.4	.5	.5
(Own or family income--in 1000's)	194	172	3.6	4.8	191	1.00	168	1.00	.4	1.0	1.0
(Number of successful contacts with officials or politicians)	211	199	4.0	1.5	214	.95	200	.94	1.8	.5	.5
(Number of all contacts with officials or politicians)	211	199	4.9	.5	214	.96	200	.99	1.3	.0	.0
Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale--revised	124	161	4.0	1.5	123	1.00	161	1.00	.0	.0	.0
Chapin's Social Status scale--original weights	50	83	3.6	2.9	52	1.00	83	1.00	.4	1.0	1.0
Chapin's Social Status scale--Guttman weights	52	83	3.6	2.9	54	1.00	83	1.00	.4	1.0	1.0
(Rent--actual or estimated--per room)	194	169	.9	1.5	203	1.00	175	1.00	5.3	4.4	4.4
(Number of rooms)	224	205	.4	.0	223	1.00	205	1.00	.0	.0	.0

Table 26 (Continued)

Variable	Number of Substantive Scores	Percentage of Coder Disagreements	Intraclass Correlation between Coders						Percentage of Editing Discrepancies	
					Whites		Blacks		Whites	Blacks
			Whites	Blacks	N	lation	Corre-	N		
(Lister's rating of house type)	223	206	.0	.0	223	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0
Interviewer's rating of building type--private home	193	188	.0	.0	193	1.00	188	1.00	.0	.0
Interviewer's rating of building condition	217	203	.0	.0	217	1.00	203	1.00	.0	.0
(Lister's rating of dwelling area)	208	200	.0	.0	208	1.00	200	1.00	.0	.0
Neighbor's occupation--Duncan	208	178	10.7	12.1	208	.97	180	.98	.4	1.5
(Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position)	143	125	25.3	12.1	162	.94	130	.96	4.0	1.5
(Warner et al.'s Index of Status Characteristics)	141	107	22.7	14.6	157	.95	114	.96	4.4	1.5
Raised in broken home	225	204	.0	1.0	225	1.00	205	.98	.0	.0
Main support was man	223	194	1.3	1.5	221	1.00	195	.96	.0	.5
Main support's birthplace	213	178	.9	.5	213	1.00	178	1.00	.0	.5
Number of all siblings	218	202	1.8	1.0	219	1.00	201	1.00	1.3	.5
Own birthplace	223	206	.0	.0	223	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0
Size of community where raised	223	204	.0	.0	223	1.00	204	1.00	.0	.0
Length of time in Toledo	222	203	.4	1.0	224	1.00	203	1.00	.9	.0
Marital status--married	225	204	.0	.0	225	1.00	204	1.00	.0	.0
Spouse had income	219	194	.4	.5	219	1.00	194	1.00	.4	.0
Broken family	224	205	.4	1.5	225	.91	203	.98	.4	.0

Table 26 (Continued)

Variable	Number of Substantive Scores		Percentage of Coder Disagreements		Intraclass Correlation between Coders						Percentage of Editing Discrepancies	
					Whites		Blacks		Whites			
	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks	N	Corre- lation	N	Corre- lation	Whites	Blacks		
Extended family	224	205	.0	1.0	225	1.00	204	1.00	.4	.0		
Nonrelatives in home	224	205	.0	1.0	225	1.00	204	1.00	.4	.0		
(Number in nuclear family in home)	224	205	.4	1.0	225	1.00	204	1.00	.4	.0		
(Number in total family in home)	224	205	.4	1.0	225	1.00	204	1.00	.4	.0		
(Number of persons in home)	224	205	.4	.5	225	1.00	205	1.00	.4	.0		
Physically punishes child	203	193	3.1	1.9	201	.98	196	.97	.4	.5		
Permits child's aggression towards parent	223	206	.4	.0	223	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0		
Buys on installment plan	224	206	.4	.0	224	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0		
Life insurance policy size	209	185	.4	1.5	208	1.00	187	.85	.0	.0		
(Spare time activities: Radio and television)	202	194	.9	1.5	222	.99	204	.98	9.3	5.3		
(Spare time activities: Active sports and recreation)	202	194	5.8	2.4	222	.96	204	.98	8.9	5.3		
Activities in past week: Went to a bar	225	206	.0	.0	225	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0		
Activities in past week: Worked on car	224	203	.4	.5	224	1.00	203	1.00	.0	.0		
Activities in past week: Read Bible	225	206	.0	.0	225	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0		
Activities in past week: Sang or played instrument	224	206	.4	.0	224	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0		
Number of visits with friends	223	206	.0	.0	223	1.00	206	1.00	.0	.0		

Table 26 (Continued)

Variable	Intraclass Correlation between Coders										Percentage of Editing Discrepancies	
	Number of Substantive Scores		Percentage of Coders Disagreements		Whites				Blacks		Whites	Blacks
	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks	N	lotion	Corre-	Blacks				
Attendance at organization meetings	204	187	.9	2.4	217	1.00	193	.97	5.8	2.4		
Number of favorite television programs	216	198	5.8	4.8	215	.99	194	1.00	.0	.0		
Type of favorite television programs: Comedy	201	188	3.1	2.4	215	.96	194	.98	7.1	3.9		
Type of favorite television programs: Current affairs and news	201	188	5.3	2.9	215	.92	194	.97	6.2	3.9		
Type of favorite television programs: Movies	201	188	4.0	3.4	215	.92	194	.91	6.7	3.9		
Type of favorite television programs: Sports	201	188	2.2	1.9	215	.99	194	1.00	7.6	3.9		
First job--Duncan	214	198	24.9	22.8	218	.93	196	.96	.0	.5		
Age at first job	212	193	.9	1.0	221	1.00	201	1.00	4.0	4.4		
Number of jobs held	196	181	.9	1.0	202	1.00	186	1.00	4.4	3.9		
Currently employed full time	215	199	.0	.0	225	1.00	206	1.00	4.4	3.4		
Current or last job: Self-employed vs. works for someone else	209	188	.0	.0	216	1.00	194	1.00	3.1	2.9		
Current or last job: Length of time employed	206	187	.9	1.5	213	1.00	193	1.00	3.1	2.9		
Current or last job: Chances of advancement	203	188	.4	.0	211	1.00	195	1.00	4.0	3.4		
Current or last job: Extent of skill and talent used	207	188	1.3	.0	214	1.00	195	1.00	3.6	3.4		
Preferred job for self--Duncan	186	175	16.4	9.2	202	.93	188	.97	5.8	3.4		
Educational aspiration for self--years	208	201	2.7	3.9	209	.99	203	.99	.0	.0		

Table 26 (Continued)

Variable	Number of Substantive Scores		Percentage of Coder Disagreements		Intraclass Correlation between Coders						Percentage of Editing Discrepancies	
					Whites		Blacks		Corre- lation	N		
	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks				
Occupational aspiration for son--Duncan	155	178	3.1	3.4	153	1.00	178	.99	.4	.0		
Educational aspiration for son--years	204	204	8.0	1.9	209	.74	204	.98	.0	.0		
Expected changes in future income	215	189	1.3	.0	215	1.00	189	1.00	.0	.0		
(Blau and Duncan's Intrageneration Occupational Mobility score)	155	143	29.8	25.2	159	.83	145	.89	.4	.0		
(Blau and Duncan's Intergeneration Occupational Mobility score)	133	120	25.8	19.4	145	.88	128	.92	4.0	2.4		
(Intergeneration educational mobility)	161	137	7.6	3.9	161	.93	137	1.00	.0	.0		
Intrageneration income mobility	223	191	.4	.0	223	1.00	191	1.00	.0	.0		
(Lenski's Index of Status Crystallization)	103	113	17.3	7.3	110	.91	121	.99	3.6	2.4		
(Laumann's Index of Associational Status Congruence)	133	96	40.4	28.6	148	.81	111	.90	5.3	4.4		
Present vs. future orientation	225	206	.0	.5	225	1.00	206	.98	.0	.0		
Chooses immediate vs. delayed gratification in spending windfall	172	178	4.0	3.9	173	1.00	176	.94	1.3	1.0		
Voting frequency in elections	209	191	.4	.0	211	.99	191	1.00	.9	.0		
Religious interest	222	205	.0	.0	222	1.00	205	1.00	.0	.0		
Date of interview	225	206	.9	2.4	225	1.00	206	.99	.0	.0		
Length of interview	224	205	.0	.5	224	1.00	205	1.00	.0	.0		

Table 26 (Continued)

Variable	Number of Substantive Scores		Percentage of Coder Disagreements		Intraclass Correlation between Coders				Percentage of Editing Discrepancies	
					Whites		Blacks			
	Whites	Blacks	Whites	Blacks	N	Corre- lation	N	Corre- lation	Whites	Blacks
Interview reassigned	225	206	.9	.5	225	.97	206	.98	.0	.0
Interview validated	225	206	.0	1.5	225	1.00	205	.88	.0	.0
Interviewer: Sex is male	225	206	1.8	.0	225	.95	206	1.00	.0	.0
Interviewer: Age	100	164	.9	1.9	100	.99	164	.98	.0	.0
Interviewer: Education	225	206	.0	1.9	225	1.00	206	.97	.0	.0
Interviewer's rating of frankness	221	205	.0	.5	221	1.00	205	1.00	.0	.0
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale--revised	215	200	.4	.5	215	1.00	200	1.00	.0	.0

Note. All of the interclass correlations, except those of .00, are significant at the .01 level (one-tailed). Variables that are algebraically or experimentally dependent on basic variables are shown in parentheses.

Table 27

Internal-Consistency Reliability of Basic Variables

Variable	N Components	Whites		Blacks	
		N	Reliability	N	Reliability
Number of organization memberships	14	211	.15	200	.13
Possessions	6	224	.67	200	.68
Number of spare time activities	17	202	-.58	194	-.70

Table 28

Internal-Consistency Reliability of Supplementary Variables

Variable	N Components	Whites		Blacks	
		N	Reliability	N	Reliability
Own or family income--in 1000's	2	194	-.04	172	.51
Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism scale--revised	6	124	.50	161	.34
Chapin's Social Status scale--original weights	22	50	.57	83	.70
Chapin's Social Status scale--Guttman weights	21	52	.66	83	.71
Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position	2	143	.62	125	.63
Warner et al.'s Index of Status Characteristics	4	141	.58	107	.51
Number of all siblings	2	218	-.03	202	-.10
Number in nuclear family in home	4	224	.18	205	.15
Number in total family in home	8	224	.14	205	.03
Number of persons in home	10	224	.12	205	-.07
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale--revised	6	215	.33	200	.53

Table 29
Percentage of Total Variance Accounted for
by First-Order Factors

Factor	Variance	
	Whites	Blacks
I	18.9%	13.4%
II	5.3	5.4
III	4.6	4.5
IV	3.1	4.3
V	2.9	3.2
VI	2.6	2.5
VII	2.2	2.5
VIII	1.8	2.3
IX	1.6	2.1
X	1.5	2.1
XI	1.5	1.8
XII	1.3	1.7
XIII	1.2	1.5
XIV	1.2	1.4
XV	1.1	1.4
XVI	1.1	1.3
XVII	1.0	1.1
XVIII	.9	1.0
XIX		.9
Total	53.8%	54.4%

Table 30

Intercorrelations of Obliquely Rotated First-Order Factors

Factor	Factor																	
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII
I		.67	.48	.35	.33	.44	.28	.16	.46	-.27	.41	.47	.20	.41	.33	.06	-.01	.09
II	.12		.46	.25	.35	.25	.21	.08	.36	-.28	.23	.39	.15	.28	.38	.10	.02	.07
III	.43	.19		.38	.07	.25	.38	.10	.14	-.29	.27	.30	.16	.16	.10	.18	.08	-.01
IV	.17	-.01	.03		.07	.10	.17	.32	.12	-.33	.33	.23	.17	.18	.10	.20	.14	-.02
V	.13	.19	.22	-.07		.46	.21	.00	.27	-.12	.30	.12	.36	.27	.20	-.18	-.25	.35
VI	.18	.24	.16	.19	-.06		.12	.15	.38	-.04	.38	.19	.12	.26	.17	-.10	-.10	.17
VII	.34	.07	.23	.34	.15	.31		-.05	.15	-.25	.19	.18	.54	.30	-.02	-.14	.07	.21
VIII	.33	.24	.28	.25	.26	.31	.31		.13	.10	.18	.19	-.10	.08	-.06	.27	.09	.02
IX	.30	.08	.26	.15	.12	.17	.33	.18		-.27	.17	.16	.14	.24	.39	-.20	.01	.15
X	.25	.31	.48	.24	.27	.21	.35	.39	.06		-.13	-.16	-.20	-.12	-.32	.06	-.27	.01
XI	.11	.22	.08	.11	.01	.04	.15	.15	.02	.20		.07	.20	.07	.11	.12	.02	.10
XII	.00	-.39	-.18	.20	-.55	.04	.04	-.13	.02	-.26	-.07		.18	.52	.11	.17	.15	-.10
XIII	.11	.00	.10	.14	-.03	.28	.31	.17	.22	.18	.06	.30		.28	-.01	-.20	.11	.05
XIV	-.06	.16	.11	.21	-.12	.00	.02	-.03	-.08	.22	.10	-.10	-.14		.10	-.04	-.17	.22
XV	.28	.20	.24	.03	.42	-.01	.41	.38	.11	.31	.21	-.38	-.11	.16		.10	-.08	.03
XVI	-.16	.31	.07	-.14	.18	-.07	-.21	-.17	-.07	.06	-.03	-.39	-.30	.14	-.06		-.03	-.18
XVII	.25	.26	.17	.21	.17	.31	.28	.38	.23	.27	.20	-.03	.21	-.16	.13	-.08		-.40
XVIII	.32	.04	.25	.29	.23	.13	.53	.30	.21	.34	.02	.03	.27	.02	.36	-.27	.14	
XIX	.07	.06	.03	-.09	.46	.04	.18	.19	.12	.08	.04	-.28	-.13	-.27	.30	.08	.30	.09

Note. The intercorrelations of the white factors appear above the diagonal and those for the black factors below it.

Table 31
Obliquely Rotated Loadings of Basic Variables on White First-Order Factors

Variable	Factor																			h ²
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII		
SELF-REPORT OF COMPARATIVE SOCIAL STANDING	10	13	17	-.05	-.10	32	-.15	00	-.06	10	11	-.02	05	-.02	-.03	11	-.08	05	52	
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF SOCIAL CLASS	37	12	06	00	08	-.06	08	-.03	09	-.01	02	03	06	-.18	-.14	01	13	10	80	
OWN OCCUPATION--DUNCAN	44	-.08	-.16	08	03	09	-.02	00	05	01	-.06	06	04	06	-.07	02	-.02	01	62	
OWN EDUCATION--YEARS	35	06	02	10	-.21	04	-.06	03	03	02	-.02	13	03	03	00	01	-.06	-.03	67	
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF INTELLIGENCE	49	-.06	-.02	00	-.09	02	08	02	-.08	07	-.07	-.05	07	08	10	03	02	-.11	60	
PROTESTANT RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE	-.02	14	06	08	03	03	-.05	00	05	62	03	03	-.09	06	08	-.07	18	10	51	
SEX IS MALE	-.13	03	65	-.03	-.01	-.02	-.16	04	10	05	03	-.08	05	03	-.01	-.06	04	00	55	
AGE--YEARS	-.10	-.05	-.25	00	56	00	-.11	13	08	06	-.13	-.05	06	04	-.04	00	03	02	82	
MAIN SUPPORT'S OCCUPATION--DUNCAN	09	-.05	-.01	03	-.02	12	14	14	-.01	00	-.14	52	01	-.27	09	-.08	-.12	11	54	
MAIN SUPPORT'S EDUCATION--YEARS	08	01	-.06	-.03	-.07	-.07	04	-.13	09	06	13	53	-.08	-.15	-.02	-.11	-.02	03	46	
FRIEND'S OCCUPATION--DUNCAN	46	02	-.11	-.03	06	-.03	01	-.03	-.06	-.09	11	-.02	-.06	09	-.19	-.01	-.09	-.01	63	
SELF-REPORT OF COMPARATIVE INCOME AND WEALTH	17	05	37	-.03	10	-.07	00	06	11	09	03	01	-.09	-.04	12	-.01	-.04	-.01	66	
SOURCE OF INCOME	-.04	00	01	-.09	14	03	10	02	34	09	06	18	-.01	-.12	-.12	-.11	00	10	41	
OWN INCOME--IN 1000'S	06	05	32	00	00	01	00	-.04	05	-.09	01	-.04	20	14	07	-.01	01	05	66	
FAMILY SAVINGS	12	01	09	-.05	54	-.19	-.11	-.01	07	01	06	-.04	-.12	03	01	-.03	11	-.08	52	
FAMILY DEBTS	03	06	-.15	03	-.06	-.02	58	-.02	-.02	-.01	-.03	07	-.15	-.09	02	04	00	-.02	41	
SELF-REPORT OF COMPARATIVE INFLUENCE AND POWER	02	05	09	-.01	12	27	10	01	01	09	12	08	-.01	-.05	00	25	-.10	-.02	57	
DECISION MAKER IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS	01	02	-.02	05	-.02	08	-.12	09	-.05	04	33	19	12	08	-.10	-.03	15	12	49	
TAKES ACTIVE PART IN LOCAL ISSUES	03	02	05	02	10	-.08	-.03	70	-.07	-.02	00	-.05	08	-.02	-.03	-.08	-.03	03	67	
PEOPLE ASK FOR HIS/HER OPINIONS	05	-.06	10	02	-.11	05	00	29	14	01	12	-.06	08	02	04	18	07	04	43	
THINKS PUBLIC OFFICIALS CARE ABOUT HIM/HER	-.11	00	03	03	-.01	-.05	-.08	04	11	06	51	04	-.10	02	02	-.02	00	-.09	37	
NUMBER OF OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS HE/SHE HAS MET	06	09	04	-.08	-.08	06	-.22	09	03	-.05	-.11	-.06	61	-.02	-.01	05	-.10	01	47	
HAD CONTACT WITH OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS ABOUT SOMETHING HE/SHE WANTED	01	-.07	02	10	04	-.07	03	46	-.06	-.04	27	02	03	09	06	-.08	-.05	-.01	55	
NUMBER OF ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS	-.08	05	00	67	08	03	-.04	07	04	02	04	09	-.09	00	-.03	-.01	-.07	-.07	79	
NUMBER OF LEADERSHIP POSITIONS IN ORGANIZATIONS	04	-.11	-.04	59	-.10	06	05	-.03	03	05	05	-.01	-.09	00	-.01	02	02	17	57	
NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONS THAT TAKES STANDS ON PUBLIC ISSUES	11	00	-.06	55	01	00	09	04	-.09	13	-.05	-.11	05	-.06	-.07	-.04	01	-.20	53	
OWN OCCUPATION--CENTERS' POWER	00	-.10	27	08	01	06	-.13	-.11	51	-.04	-.07	-.01	04	21	-.13	-.03	-.13	06	76	
NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES SUPERVISED	01	06	07	-.01	01	-.05	-.09	03	01	05	07	-.22	00	43	-.01	06	06	-.05	24	
CENTERS' CLASS IDENTIFICATION MEASURE	25	-.06	-.02	-.11	12	17	11	-.08	-.07	04	04	09	-.03	00	23	-.03	-.09	-.17	56	
THINKS OF SELF AS BEING IN A SOCIAL CLASS	03	-.02	11	-.03	08	06	01	-.03	-.05	19	01	-.09	-.10	09	12	03	63	23	46	
BELIEVES THERE ARE TWO OR MORE CLASSES	-.02	04	-.03	-.03	-.01	00	-.04	03	-.05	07	-.07	08	01	-.05	09	06	23	61	43	
SAYS WORKERS LIKE UNIONS, AND BUSINESSMEN DO NOT	-.03	11	05	10	01	11	-.15	-.22	00	02	-.34	04	05	-.15	03	10	03	-.07	32	

Table 31 (Continued)

Variable	Factor																		h ²
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	
BELONGS TO A UNION	-05	00	25	13	02	-25	-10	04	-09	-05	00	-06	07	-24	08	-01	-04	-03	42
REPUBLICAN POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCE	14	07	-03	-05	-01	08	02	11	29	41	-06	-02	04	14	01	-10	08	-15	61
HAPPINESS	03	02	16	06	-05	24	-08	-06	-03	01	21	-15	01	00	-09	-10	03	-10	34
EXTENT OF SUCCESS IN LIFE	05	00	02	14	10	54	01	-05	-14	-07	-08	-15	-06	-06	12	-16	14	08	70
CURRENT OR LAST JOB: SATISFACTION	07	04	-12	01	05	15	10	07	-01	-07	07	-16	-14	06	-19	10	00	03	19
POSSESSIONS	12	05	34	03	-03	-16	06	-03	07	02	03	16	-09	05	00	01	07	02	64
NUMBER OF NEWSPAPERS	20	00	04	-01	14	08	-28	06	-06	-19	-07	14	14	-10	-01	-02	02	-05	43
NUMBER OF MAGAZINES	11	10	-09	01	04	07	-05	06	06	-04	12	09	-14	10	00	04	09	-16	40
FOOD EXPENDITURES	-07	-04	27	04	12	06	35	-01	03	-12	-14	07	-04	08	-08	15	14	-10	70
HOUSING EXPENDITURES	06	24	05	04	-20	-04	42	07	02	-12	-05	01	-12	-04	-03	-06	-01	01	63
RENT--ACTUAL OR ESTIMATED	00	23	-07	00	02	-04	20	-04	-04	-10	09	04	25	14	12	01	00	00	76
PERSONS PER ROOM	-03	-12	46	-09	-16	05	08	06	-16	-01	-08	05	-01	04	-20	-09	16	-11	73
OWNER VS. RENTER OF HOME	-15	18	03	04	37	-04	08	07	-01	00	01	-05	-05	-04	01	18	-04	06	40
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF HOUSE TYPE	12	35	-04	-05	12	00	09	06	15	-16	-02	-06	06	-09	03	00	05	-03	87
SELF-REPORT OF COMPARATIVE NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITY	-14	59	06	-09	-05	16	03	01	00	13	08	-04	02	-05	-07	-04	-02	-02	59
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF DWELLING AREA	-04	61	-05	01	-04	04	10	-05	06	-03	04	-01	10	-06	-01	-10	05	00	90
CENSUS: MEDIAN HOUSE VALUE FOR CENSUS TRACT	00	52	-05	07	03	-02	09	-03	-06	10	-08	01	05	16	-02	-03	-02	04	75
CENSUS: MEDIAN RENT FOR CENSUS TRACT	08	45	02	03	06	-11	-04	-03	-13	15	-13	-03	05	26	01	06	00	07	78
CENSUS: PERCENT DETERIORATING AND DILAPIDATED HOUSING FOR CENSUS TRACT	-14	-40	-07	05	-12	06	11	00	17	-03	11	-08	10	-02	15	10	12	-03	62
NUMBER OF TIMES UNEMPLOYED	03	-03	09	00	18	-49	03	05	00	01	09	-08	-08	01	05	-07	-02	03	31
NUMBER OF SPARE TIME ACTIVITIES	03	01	-06	-04	-03	07	-24	-01	-11	-12	07	07	-13	11	37	02	15	03	48
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF GRAMMAR	55	-07	-08	00	-04	-08	00	05	-02	05	-14	02	03	-08	-04	17	11	13	56
ANCHIE	-07	-10	-01	-04	00	-04	08	01	-19	16	-03	00	04	-07	52	-06	06	08	37
AUTHORITARIANISM	-05	-02	-05	04	18	14	-01	-11	06	04	05	09	06	-09	-08	-01	19	-03	21
CONGENIAL VS. ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS IN CHOOSING A JOB	09	-04	-02	09	06	-16	-02	-14	06	35	22	07	09	-04	09	01	-01	-01	25
PERSONAL VS. IMPERSONAL FACTORS IN GETTING AHEAD ON A JOB	-03	-02	00	00	06	-14	03	-03	40	07	16	02	01	-03	-13	17	02	-12	24
PERSONAL VS. IMPERSONAL THINGS AFFECTING SUCCESS	12	-10	-09	-01	06	02	06	-08	08	-09	-06	-14	05	09	-06	63	04	06	45

Note. These loadings are actually correlations with reference vectors. Decimal points have been omitted.

Table 32

Obliquely Rotated Loadings of Basic Variables on Black First-Order Factors

Variable	Factor																				h ²
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	XIX		
SELF-REPORT OF COMPARATIVE SOCIAL STANDING	-.02	.10	-.02	.71	.08	-.03	-.10	-.01	-.03	-.04	.01	-.03	.02	-.07	.05	-.06	-.05	.00	-.05	.64	
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF SOCIAL CLASS	.36	.32	.02	.04	-.14	.01	.18	.07	.02	-.09	.00	.13	-.01	.05	.03	.02	.02	.06	.03	.68	
OWN OCCUPATION--DUNCAN	.00	.17	-.03	-.05	.08	-.12	.11	.09	-.02	.03	.06	-.03	.11	.34	.03	-.06	.10	.09	-.13	.49	
OWN EDUCATION--YEARS	-.02	.43	.00	-.07	.11	.00	.02	.19	-.12	.17	-.04	-.03	.03	.06	.06	-.04	-.05	.03	-.14	.72	
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF INTELLIGENCE	.15	.57	.03	.02	-.09	-.01	.02	.04	-.02	-.04	-.02	.04	.04	.03	.05	.00	.04	.06	.05	.64	
PROTESTANT RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE	-.05	.06	.05	-.05	.13	-.04	-.04	-.17	.02	-.07	.05	.37	-.01	-.14	.03	.02	-.02	.04	.08	.32	
SEX IS MALE	-.04	-.07	-.01	.13	.04	.02	.28	.02	.01	-.10	.07	-.14	.00	-.02	.07	-.12	.08	.07	.17	.57	
AGE--YEARS	.03	-.18	-.05	-.04	-.26	.08	.13	.01	.10	-.11	.15	.23	-.05	-.01	-.04	-.05	-.05	-.05	-.05	.78	
MAIN SUPPORT'S OCCUPATION--DUNCAN	.11	-.01	.03	-.05	-.08	.16	.02	-.04	-.10	.45	.02	.05	-.07	.20	.03	-.05	.03	-.13	.00	.56	
MAIN SUPPORT'S EDUCATION--YEARS	.02	.10	-.12	-.05	.00	.00	-.18	-.03	.06	.73	-.03	.00	-.05	-.04	-.01	-.07	.01	.04	.04	.82	
FRIEND'S OCCUPATION--DUNCAN	-.05	.03	.05	-.09	-.05	-.05	-.02	-.01	-.08	.03	.01	-.08	-.04	.09	.01	.07	.75	.09	-.17	.77	
SELF-REPORT OF COMPARATIVE INCOME AND WEALTH	.11	-.01	.03	.38	.10	.01	.04	-.01	-.03	.03	.08	-.07	.04	-.01	-.05	-.05	-.10	.21	.01	.53	
SOURCE OF INCOME	.01	.11	-.02	-.11	.04	-.09	.75	.04	-.02	-.15	.08	-.08	-.06	-.02	-.15	.12	-.03	-.14	-.05	.70	
OWN INCOME--IN 1000'S	-.12	.06	.05	.11	.10	.15	.33	-.07	.12	.12	-.09	-.08	-.07	.17	-.01	-.02	.02	.06	.17	.81	
FAMILY SAVINGS	-.04	.05	-.02	-.04	-.09	.32	.15	-.03	.06	.08	.02	-.14	-.08	.05	-.04	-.04	-.03	.08	-.01	.32	
FAMILY DEBTS	.00	.03	-.15	.09	.00	-.16	.11	.08	.26	.09	.33	-.01	.03	-.08	.01	.09	.04	-.07	.06	.41	
SELF-REPORT OF COMPARATIVE INFLUENCE AND POWER	-.01	.08	.02	.62	-.06	.00	-.04	.07	.02	-.09	-.03	.02	.02	-.14	.10	-.02	-.05	.07	.03	.58	
DECISION MAKER IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS	-.03	-.01	.02	.28	.06	.01	.06	.30	-.03	.00	-.05	.09	-.03	.13	-.12	.05	.04	-.15	.01	.35	
TAKES ACTIVE PART IN LOCAL ISSUES	-.08	.08	.01	-.02	-.08	-.03	.01	.72	.04	-.05	.04	-.04	-.04	.07	-.08	.01	-.09	-.02	-.01	.69	
PEOPLE ASK FOR HIS/HER OPINIONS	-.01	-.01	.05	.08	-.06	.03	-.01	.38	.07	-.04	.00	-.05	-.01	.09	.12	.11	.06	-.11	-.01	.39	
THINKS PUBLIC OFFICIALS CARE ABOUT HIM/HER	.00	-.15	.00	.23	.00	.06	-.31	.25	.04	.03	-.02	.04	-.13	.06	-.06	.07	.02	.24	-.04	.37	
NUMBER OF OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS HE/SHE HAS MET	-.03	-.02	-.02	-.01	.00	.17	.07	.02	.02	-.06	.69	.00	-.05	-.07	-.11	-.01	.00	.06	-.06	.59	
HAD CONTACT WITH OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS ABOUT SOMETHING HE/SHE WANTED	-.10	-.03	-.06	.08	.03	.04	.00	.30	.08	.04	.03	-.04	-.02	.14	-.06	.02	.12	-.12	.01	.26	
NUMBER OF ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS	.09	.00	.02	.04	.02	.70	-.10	.03	-.04	.02	.09	.03	.03	-.02	.05	-.04	.02	.05	-.03	.80	
NUMBER OF LEADERSHIP POSITIONS IN ORGANIZATIONS	-.13	.13	-.01	.01	-.01	.23	-.06	.02	.05	.02	-.07	.02	.32	-.08	-.26	-.06	.10	.13	-.01	.68	
NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONS THAT TAKES STANDS ON PUBLIC ISSUES	.10	-.08	.07	-.05	.05	.61	-.12	.06	-.04	-.01	.11	-.11	-.05	.08	.14	.05	-.11	-.05	.02	.62	
OWN OCCUPATION--CENTERS' POWER	.00	-.16	.10	.00	.06	.05	.07	.02	-.02	.03	.30	-.02	.23	.24	-.04	-.02	-.05	.03	.05	.38	
NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES SUPERVISED	.07	-.04	.00	.03	.01	-.10	-.08	-.07	-.03	-.09	-.01	-.13	.79	.14	.09	.08	-.06	.02	.07	.70	
CENTERS' CLASS IDENTIFICATION MEASURE	-.01	-.01	.02	.70	-.08	-.11	.06	-.01	-.09	.05	-.14	.12	.08	.09	.03	-.04	.01	-.23	-.07	.28	
THINKS OF SELF AS BEING IN A SOCIAL CLASS	-.10	-.04	.02	-.05	-.09	.07	-.10	.06	.00	.17	-.17	.17	.11	.00	.39	.05	.01	-.14	.07	.28	
BELIEVES THERE ARE TWO OR MORE CLASSES	-.12	.09	-.08	.10	-.04	.12	-.12	-.11	.11	-.07	-.04	.02	.02	-.06	.60	.05	.01	-.02	-.10	.48	
SAYS WORKERS LIKE UNIONS, AND BUSINESSMEN DO NOT	-.12	-.09	.02	-.13	.02	.28	.18	-.10	-.05	.01	.00	-.06	-.04	.06	.04	.13	.03	.01	.02	.24	

Table 32 (Continued)

Variable	Factor																				h ²
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	XIX		
BELONGS TO A UNION	13	-07	-08	-06	20	09	12	15	-13	-13	-17	05	-07	-08	11	-17	04	01	06	47	
REPUBLICAN POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCE	-06	08	05	-02	04	-07	-21	-08	02	07	33	14	-07	13	10	-51	14	-05	01	60	
HAPPINESS	00	-01	-05	11	-02	03	-13	-12	02	-03	04	04	04	-03	-08	11	08	57	-04	46	
EXTENT OF SUCCESS IN LIFE	10	-15	00	18	-11	-07	04	-01	-11	08	00	13	-02	13	-06	09	14	24	03	43	
CURRENT OR LAST JOB: SATISFACTION	-07	-09	08	11	-10	-03	22	-10	00	14	-01	06	-02	-18	12	01	-14	17	-25	51	
POSSESSIONS	00	05	-01	00	12	17	17	-01	20	16	-08	-10	05	-04	09	05	12	01	-07	67	
NUMBER OF NEWSPAPERS	-20	11	04	05	-13	-02	03	16	-08	12	16	-04	03	-16	06	00	-02	01	11	27	
NUMBER OF MAGAZINES	06	14	03	-08	04	13	06	12	-05	12	25	-04	06	-20	-02	09	-04	-08	-04	42	
FOOD EXPENDITURES	05	-03	-01	02	64	02	11	00	09	06	02	18	02	07	-04	00	-08	-06	00	68	
HOUSING EXPENDITURES	18	-17	15	-09	07	-19	-02	08	39	06	-08	-11	03	-12	04	-02	14	-04	-08	63	
RENT--ACTUAL OR ESTIMATED	04	-01	13	-03	03	-06	-04	02	69	06	01	01	-06	02	01	04	-12	05	06	73	
PERSONS PER ROOM	-12	00	01	03	74	01	02	-10	-01	-11	03	17	-01	04	-07	03	-01	-01	-11	71	
OWNER VS. RENTER OF HOME	07	-03	-09	02	-01	09	05	06	56	-12	08	14	06	-01	12	00	-01	-01	-04	66	
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF HOUSE TYPE	67	14	-05	-01	-05	11	05	-10	09	01	-01	01	00	03	-01	06	-01	00	-04	74	
SELF-REPORT OF COMPARATIVE NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITY	63	-12	-01	00	06	-02	-07	02	02	15	-03	02	05	-01	-14	-07	-14	-02	-11	65	
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF DWELLING AREA	69	15	04	01	-07	04	-06	-11	03	-04	-01	-05	02	09	-07	00	07	01	06	75	
CENSUS: MEDIAN HOUSE VALUE FOR CENSUS TRACT	-03	02	82	-02	-02	04	02	02	01	-07	-01	03	02	-08	-01	01	01	-07	00	00	
CENSUS: MEDIAN RENT FOR CENSUS TRACT	05	03	48	01	-02	-03	-06	-04	11	11	02	02	-02	-16	-12	-05	08	00	08	57	
CENSUS: PERCENT DETERIORATING AND DILAPIDATED HOUSING FOR CENSUS TRACT	02	-07	-64	-04	-04	-06	00	-02	-01	16	04	-06	01	-07	01	-06	-02	01	04	62	
NUMBER OF TIMES UNEMPLOYED	-05	01	01	-02	-09	-01	00	-02	02	05	-04	11	06	09	-05	-05	-17	-04	68	53	
NUMBER OF SPARE TIME ACTIVITIES	07	04	-02	14	03	26	-07	-06	-02	07	07	-10	-01	01	05	12	02	-11	-05	26	
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF GRAMMAR	05	65	04	13	05	-04	10	-05	00	09	-01	15	-08	-12	-02	-05	00	-11	03	66	
ANCPIE	09	-09	02	17	00	01	10	-05	-20	-03	08	-27	00	-22	-02	-10	13	-18	-08	26	
AUTHORITARIANISM	03	11	04	05	18	-11	-12	00	02	06	-02	58	-09	04	07	14	-05	02	06	42	
CUNGENIAL VS. ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS IN CHOOSING A JOB	07	-06	-06	-08	04	07	-03	11	-02	00	-07	00	06	49	-03	-03	06	-04	09	29	
PERSONAL VS. IMPERSONAL FACTORS IN GETTING AHEAD ON A JOB	05	-01	-04	-03	09	-04	04	-04	-21	11	07	24	01	-16	01	32	10	08	13	32	
PERSONAL VS. IMPERSONAL THINGS AFFECTING SUCCESS	-03	-01	05	-06	03	01	03	06	07	-08	08	21	04	01	11	57	11	11	-06	43	

Note. These loadings are actually correlations with reference vectors. Decimal points have been omitted.

Table 33

Estimated Obliquely Rotated Loadings of Supplementary Variables on White First-Order Factors

Variable	Factor																			h ²
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII		
OWN NATIONALITY--LENSKI	13	18	-17	05	-05	-02	-04	15	04	31	-05	13	-03	00	-04	-12	08	-06	38	
OWN NATIONALITY--ROSSI	12	18	-16	07	-03	04	-02	12	08	28	-13	13	-03	-03	-03	-14	04	-12	38	
RACE IS BLACK	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF SKIN COLOR	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	
MAIN SUPPORT'S NATIONALITY--ROSSI	19	15	-12	04	00	-02	-05	10	06	20	-13	07	-07	-03	-07	-13	03	-06	29	
OTHER FAMILY MEMBERS' INCOME--IN 1000'S	14	-19	06	00	10	-01	06	04	10	-05	01	-05	-16	10	02	02	11	-15	18	
OWN OR FAMILY INCOME--IN 1000'S	05	03	37	01	-01	-02	-01	-03	07	-06	04	-09	20	21	13	-04	00	00	74	
(NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL CONTACTS WITH OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS)	-03	-04	06	07	05	-12	-10	33	01	06	23	05	18	05	10	-09	-06	-01	35	
(NUMBER OF ALL CONTACTS WITH OFFICIALS OF POLITICIANS)	-13	01	03	-08	04	-11	05	61	-05	-03	33	13	08	07	22	-26	-10	-10	68	
CENTERS' CONSERVATISM-RADICALISM SCALE--REVISED	18	-12	05	-05	08	10	02	-02	10	05	-07	04	-01	18	04	-16	-12	-11	44	
CHAPIN'S SOCIAL STATUS SCALE--ORIGINAL WEIGHTS	10	34	-39	08	13	20	-49	-13	23	-43	-29	29	28	01	-46	34	-03	08	58	
CHAPIN'S SOCIAL STATUS SCALE--GUTTMAN WEIGHTS	15	11	-21	17	20	08	-43	-31	40	-22	-41	21	35	-17	-28	45	09	15	24	
(RENT--ACTUAL OR ESTIMATED--PER ROOM)	05	24	-08	-07	04	-05	03	-03	-09	-13	12	04	33	15	11	-06	03	-03	78	
(NUMBER OF ROOMS)	-10	06	00	10	06	-04	32	05	13	-11	02	02	-03	08	02	19	-08	-01	40	
(LISTER'S RATING OF HOUSE TYPE)	11	39	06	-08	09	-11	00	-04	00	-02	03	01	05	02	-04	-04	04	02	64	
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF BUILDING TYPE--PRIVATE HOME	-13	28	04	-06	18	02	13	18	02	-12	-02	-04	-09	-03	-16	11	-19	-12	33	
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF BUILDING CONDITION	14	16	-13	-03	16	-09	-11	-07	02	-08	16	-10	-02	-04	-03	02	25	05	35	
(LISTER'S RATING OF DWELLING AREA)	06	44	04	-02	14	-15	-02	-04	03	-04	03	06	-04	01	-13	-05	-05	06	66	
NEIGHBOR'S OCCUPATION--DUNCAN	05	31	04	05	06	-05	-02	-03	-02	03	-01	18	-02	-11	02	-03	01	16	44	
(HOLLINGSHEAD'S TWO FACTOR INDEX OF SOCIAL POSITION)	41	01	-20	20	-11	19	03	-01	10	22	-09	00	02	25	-06	-01	-01	06	00	
(WARNER ET AL.'S INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS)	29	13	-13	09	14	07	11	-08	21	07	-03	03	-02	04	-03	-04	06	03	89	
RAISED IN BROKEN HOME	-12	03	05	06	00	-04	-07	00	03	-04	06	-03	-08	09	01	-08	-05	-05	06	
MAIN SUPPORT WAS MAN	14	02	-13	-01	-07	11	04	07	-06	01	-12	-12	12	-08	-03	02	08	04	09	
MAIN SUPPORT'S BIRTHPLACE	12	-01	03	-10	-08	-19	02	16	03	11	08	19	-13	-08	17	-16	04	-04	26	
NUMBER OF ALL SIBLINGS	-19	07	-08	-09	-03	09	01	07	-11	-16	01	-07	03	01	-07	-12	-10	-01	22	
OWN BIRTHPLACE	23	-03	-02	01	-12	-14	-07	10	-01	05	-01	01	05	-05	03	-06	13	21	17	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY WHERE RAISED	01	-08	03	03	-06	03	06	-09	-02	-23	00	27	-01	-15	-09	09	-16	09	21	
LENGTH OF TIME IN TOLEDO	-07	-09	-23	04	36	05	-09	14	02	-13	-14	06	20	-19	-06	04	-13	-01	53	
MARITAL STATUS--MARRIED	-20	08	74	-08	-06	-02	-15	05	10	07	12	-13	05	11	-07	-10	09	-04	77	
SPOUSE HAD INCOME	-05	01	18	07	-04	-05	08	01	02	19	09	-02	-14	12	12	-05	-02	-23	21	
BROKEN FAMILY	-04	17	-31	03	-10	-18	35	-12	-01	00	15	12	-04	-11	-04	07	-07	-01	34	
EXTENDED FAMILY	01	00	-04	-09	-11	15	03	09	-09	-14	-05	-01	05	-09	-07	04	-18	-02	09	

Table 33 (Continued)

Variable	Factor																		h ²
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	
NONRELATIVES IN HOME	00	02	-15	01	-09	04	-03	-10	-04	-06	-03	05	-02	01	-10	08	02	11	09
(NUMBER IN NUCLEAR FAMILY IN HOME)	-09	-09	46	-03	-07	04	24	10	-13	-06	-10	05	-06	11	-21	-04	17	-16	86
(NUMBER IN TOTAL FAMILY IN HOME)	-09	-09	46	-04	-08	06	24	10	-14	-08	-11	05	-06	10	-22	-04	15	-16	87
(NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOME)	-09	-09	45	-04	-08	06	24	10	-14	-08	-11	05	-06	10	-23	-03	15	-15	87
PHYSICALLY PUNISHES CHILD	-10	-01	-01	-04	00	00	01	02	-07	00	-01	-08	04	06	00	09	10	02	09
PERMITS CHILD'S AGGRESSION TOWARDS PARENT	19	-13	-08	15	03	-20	17	-05	03	-07	-04	06	-05	-08	-02	-12	-14	-06	21
BUYS ON INSTALLMENT PLAN	03	-02	27	05	-28	00	01	06	-11	07	01	-01	00	-15	-07	-03	12	20	43
LIFE INSURANCE POLICY SIZE	06	03	10	04	-10	06	05	-08	15	-06	05	-01	12	18	-04	-04	-05	00	41
(SPARE TIME ACTIVITIES: RADIO AND TELEVISION)	-06	06	-03	-10	-06	07	-10	-08	-15	-05	-01	03	00	07	31	-09	09	07	21
(SPARE TIME ACTIVITIES: ACTIVE SPORTS AND RECREATION)	-13	06	19	-09	-16	03	-17	06	-12	-34	27	07	-19	18	18	-01	01	-07	56
ACTIVITIES IN PAST WEEK: WENT TO A BAR	-01	00	05	-02	-28	-13	-03	06	08	-13	11	19	09	-21	-01	-12	-21	07	23
ACTIVITIES IN PAST WEEK: WORKED ON CAR	-02	-10	32	-12	-13	-03	-13	04	-02	03	04	01	02	-02	05	-04	05	11	18
ACTIVITIES IN PAST WEEK: READ BIBLE	-17	04	-14	-03	11	16	02	04	-02	02	07	-04	-06	15	-11	04	11	-15	20
ACTIVITIES IN PAST WEEK: SANG OR PLAYED INSTRUMENT	-06	02	-05	05	-18	11	00	-11	-01	02	20	21	-07	-11	09	-05	-02	01	15
NUMBER OF VISITS WITH FRIENDS	00	17	-13	-13	-28	08	-08	-09	07	06	22	11	14	-10	06	01	02	04	23
ATTENDANCE AT ORGANIZATION MEETINGS	-15	10	-10	47	-05	09	01	07	17	02	10	21	-13	-06	-02	-06	-15	-07	49
NUMBER OF FAVORITE TELEVISION PROGRAMS	-06	00	-20	-12	-10	05	01	08	04	02	18	19	-13	-07	16	-07	00	-07	25
TYPE OF FAVORITE TELEVISION PROGRAMS: COMEDY	-14	-11	-06	-09	15	01	-08	-14	19	01	-04	20	-08	03	-03	12	15	02	25
TYPE OF FAVORITE TELEVISION PROGRAMS: CURRENT AFFAIRS AND NEWS	-05	19	-03	02	17	07	06	-03	-11	-04	-06	-19	-29	16	10	-01	12	-08	25
TYPE OF FAVORITE TELEVISION PROGRAMS: MOVIES	-07	06	03	-12	-22	08	19	08	-12	-08	01	-01	-09	04	12	09	-06	-08	21
TYPE OF FAVORITE TELEVISION PROGRAMS: SPORTS	03	04	11	05	06	11	-03	-06	-22	-24	02	09	-01	-02	02	-05	05	-15	34
FIRST JOB--DUNCAN	20	09	-19	05	-13	07	03	07	07	04	01	12	10	15	-12	10	-03	-06	47
AGE AT FIRST JOB	17	10	-36	05	-09	15	04	03	-03	-02	-19	-25	02	15	03	08	09	-03	28
NUMBER OF JOBS HELD	-05	-02	18	-03	23	-37	-07	-06	03	12	08	05	-09	05	-04	-03	-04	05	23
CURRENTLY EMPLOYED FULL TIME	13	-12	52	-04	-19	-16	-07	10	-06	-08	12	-12	-08	11	14	-01	06	-05	69
CURRENT OR LAST JOB: SELF-EMPLOYED VS. WORKS FOR SOMEONE ELSE	-09	-05	10	08	-01	08	01	-04	54	00	-05	19	06	-11	-19	-15	-14	15	66
CURRENT OR LAST JOB: LENGTH OF TIME EMPLOYED	-12	-18	32	04	53	-14	-20	18	13	-06	-05	01	-03	-05	00	-16	-13	-03	59
CURRENT OR LAST JOB: CHANCES OF ADVANCEMENT	08	15	-20	17	-25	34	19	-01	15	02	-01	-12	-06	-01	-06	01	-05	13	45
CURRENT OR LAST JOB: EXTENT OF SKILL AND TALENT USED	10	-11	03	08	22	15	-07	08	-02	02	-27	-07	08	03	02	-02	00	02	24
PREFERRED JOB FOR SELF--DUNCAN	40	-05	-13	04	05	05	-10	02	01	01	01	08	-01	10	06	-06	03	-08	63
EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION FOR SELF--YEARS	18	03	10	-07	-07	02	-05	-04	08	-03	00	10	-02	06	-07	13	00	-08	32
OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATION FOR SON--DUNCAN	09	10	-12	-19	12	-06	-02	-11	-01	-04	10	-03	-10	14	-01	09	07	-02	19

Table 33 (Continued)

Variable	Factor																		h ²
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	
EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION FOR SON--YEARS	-05	16	-11	-15	02	02	-12	05	-05	-24	-03	-02	11	09	11	12	-08	-06	23
EXPECTED CHANGES IN FUTURE INCOME	09	06	18	06	-33	06	15	-13	-12	00	03	01	-12	05	17	-04	09	-09	52
(BLAU AND DUNCAN'S INTRAGENERATION OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY SCORE)	27	-11	-01	12	22	00	08	-14	06	07	-14	01	-12	-09	-02	05	05	05	25
(BLAU AND DUNCAN'S INTERGENERATION OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY SCORE)	42	03	-09	-01	05	03	-10	-24	05	02	07	-66	-15	52	-27	18	26	-15	90
(INTERGENERATION EDUCATIONAL MOBILITY)	34	-01	13	09	-05	07	-13	26	-15	04	-22	-73	12	31	06	11	01	-10	76
INTRAGENERATION INCOME MOBILITY	17	-04	33	02	-30	-06	02	07	-17	-12	06	-11	09	01	18	-02	-05	-03	57
(LENSKI'S INDEX OF STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION)	16	-10	11	-12	00	-12	-03	25	-09	-01	-04	-06	12	-04	00	-04	-08	-08	13
(LAUMANN'S INDEX OF ASSOCIATIONAL STATUS CONGRUENCE)	-09	-16	04	-14	04	09	-05	-01	-08	-02	10	16	10	-08	10	28	09	12	25
PRESENT VS. FUTURE ORIENTATION	-07	00	-28	-02	06	-11	11	-05	01	-05	-09	07	06	02	-05	09	03	16	29
CHOOSES IMMEDIATE VS. DELAYED GRATIFICATION IN SPENDING WINDFALL	-09	-02	-10	-01	15	18	-04	-09	-06	02	01	11	-09	-11	10	-12	00	10	24
VOTING FREQUENCY IN ELECTIONS	10	-04	06	05	31	-14	-07	15	13	-04	-06	08	-05	-07	-08	03	06	-19	30
RELIGIOUS INTEREST	03	06	-05	-02	08	16	-05	11	-10	-15	07	-28	-05	12	-02	-09	14	-06	24
DATE OF INTERVIEW	-08	-18	-02	-09	07	03	08	-01	10	-19	-03	12	-07	-01	19	11	00	09	21
LENGTH OF INTERVIEW	-06	02	-08	05	10	01	04	-06	03	-11	-08	-01	-10	10	05	-02	-13	-05	13
INTERVIEW REASSIGNED	-06	-10	-02	-06	12	10	-05	00	-05	-10	00	-06	-15	13	19	08	03	03	10
INTERVIEW VALIDATED	07	-06	07	-12	-16	00	01	04	10	-03	-11	-03	03	02	-12	08	-01	03	12
INTERVIEWER: SEX IS MALE	-11	-15	07	07	13	-12	11	-12	17	04	13	10	-08	02	-23	06	11	12	25
INTERVIEWER: AGE	00	24	11	-13	02	-20	-24	-03	16	-19	11	-10	-09	14	-18	-05	-22	-09	39
INTERVIEWER: EDUCATION	-01	-16	-04	08	04	-21	11	05	13	08	20	-02	-06	18	-07	-14	00	-14	24
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF FRANKNESS	06	-08	09	-05	-04	09	-03	08	-16	01	13	15	01	00	22	-16	02	-01	19
MARLOWE-CROWNE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE--REVISED	-01	-04	00	-03	31	09	-07	01	04	-04	-03	-25	04	07	-18	16	10	00	28

Note. These loadings are actually correlations with reference vectors. Variables that are algebraically or experimentally dependent on basic variables are shown in parentheses. Decimal points have been omitted.

Table 34
Estimated Obliquely Rotated Loadings of Supplementary Variables on Black First-Order Factors

Variable	Factor																			h ²
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	XIX	
OWN NATIONALITY--LENSKI	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
OWN NATIONALITY--ROSSI	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
RACE IS BLACK	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF SKIN COLOR	17	18	-15	-05	10	05	07	-07	03	13	-03	01	-09	08	-04	-04	11	-02	-17	21
MAIN SUPPORT'S NATIONALITY--ROSSI	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
OTHER FAMILY MEMBERS' INCOME--IN 1000'S	01	-01	-09	-08	-03	18	11	-11	10	24	-06	-19	-08	00	-01	02	08	06	-11	30
(OWN OR FAMILY INCOME--IN 1000'S)	-05	04	-03	-02	02	21	23	-09	18	18	-13	-19	-09	19	-07	01	08	15	09	72
(NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL CONTACTS WITH OFFICIALS OR POLITICIANS)	-09	-05	-10	14	07	15	01	26	07	08	07	11	02	03	-13	17	11	-27	14	48
(NUMBER OF ALL CONTACTS WITH OFFICIALS OF POLITICIANS)	-11	-02	-05	12	12	07	04	41	11	-02	00	02	-01	17	-17	03	12	-30	05	50
CENTERS' CONSERVATISM-RADICALISM SCALE--REVISED	13	13	-13	-15	-04	12	-05	-07	21	33	-17	05	11	09	-07	05	-02	-03	00	35
CHAPIN'S SOCIAL STATUS SCALE--ORIGINAL WEIGHTS	03	20	10	-15	-28	34	16	11	15	27	15	-06	-05	-17	06	-10	02	-10	00	04
CHAPIN'S SOCIAL STATUS SCALE--GUTTMAN WEIGHTS	07	29	15	-11	-34	12	23	09	07	07	01	00	-02	-18	16	-16	05	-13	03	83
(RENT--ACTUAL OR ESTIMATED--PER ROOM)	-21	10	27	-03	-08	-10	-13	07	18	-07	-02	-01	-10	00	03	08	-03	20	16	31
(NUMBER OF ROOMS)	11	-15	-09	-04	11	13	08	-06	50	14	-07	04	-03	02	01	-09	-01	-11	-12	46
(LISTER'S RATING OF HOUSE TYPE)	45	02	07	01	-03	13	10	-17	02	-07	-05	-08	07	00	06	-02	-01	04	09	53
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF BUILDING TYPE--PRIVATE HOME	28	04	-08	03	16	05	04	-09	37	05	01	06	04	04	-09	-15	04	-21	02	46
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF BUILDING CONDITION	45	13	-07	00	-23	-02	-07	-01	08	-07	-06	02	-01	01	07	-03	06	22	02	52
(LISTER'S RATING OF DWELLING AREA)	47	-06	05	01	03	16	05	-16	00	-03	-02	-01	00	07	10	03	06	01	05	49
NEIGHBOR'S OCCUPATION--DUNCAN	05	-07	11	00	-16	08	-01	-04	08	22	06	-04	00	05	10	21	-03	08	-03	34
(HOLLINGSHEAD'S TWO FACTOR INDEX OF SOCIAL POSITION)	10	13	-01	-21	10	-11	18	24	-16	18	26	03	06	39	-02	07	11	08	-32	12
(WARNER ET AL.'S INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS)	64	11	-04	-24	10	-13	18	01	-09	-09	18	-01	10	45	-13	15	17	16	-17	13
RAISED IN BROKEN HOME	-06	-07	-02	-03	-03	-04	-10	00	15	03	09	-05	09	-17	-05	-07	02	-01	03	15
MAIN SUPPORT WAS MAN	04	05	14	01	-15	04	03	06	-18	-20	11	06	-19	18	-04	14	-02	15	13	28
MAIN SUPPORT'S BIRTHPLACE	-03	23	-12	02	-05	04	14	-06	-08	22	-16	-15	-08	-10	05	-21	-01	-20	-07	29
NUMBER OF ALL SIBLINGS	12	19	04	06	08	-22	-01	06	06	-16	06	05	-14	12	-14	-13	-01	-05	02	20
OWN BIRTHPLACE	-02	25	02	-09	-04	06	04	-09	-09	07	06	-28	-10	-04	-04	-24	-08	-02	-02	36
SIZE OF COMMUNITY WHERE RAISED	-02	-08	-03	-01	-10	06	-08	06	-05	24	-08	-19	20	-13	22	09	-06	-14	03	31
LENGTH OF TIME IN TOLEDO	05	-05	-03	-04	-14	05	02	01	18	-12	21	05	06	-10	02	11	-13	-02	-05	24
MARITAL STATUS--MARRIED	-01	-07	-03	09	20	03	24	-06	13	-12	07	-10	-09	-04	03	-16	13	14	07	65
SPOUSE HAD INCOME	-05	-03	-05	05	00	06	07	-05	16	08	05	-19	-11	-14	10	-04	13	05	-14	24
BROKEN FAMILY	04	21	03	07	27	03	-35	-08	04	13	-05	14	01	-05	-05	09	-09	-14	-12	53
EXTENDED FAMILY	-01	-15	-05	-09	09	-08	00	-04	24	15	-02	20	-03	04	-06	03	02	-10	-12	24

Table 34 (Continued)

Variable	Factor																			h ²
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	XIX	
NONRELATIVES IN HOME	-13	01	-09	00	-02	04	19	-01	18	10	-10	00	-06	-03	-14	-08	-03	-16	-08	20
(NUMBER IN NUCLEAR FAMILY IN HOME)	10	00	-02	00	82	13	-02	-09	10	-16	01	21	06	07	02	-01	-05	-08	-09	89
(NUMBER IN TOTAL FAMILY IN HOME)	05	-03	-02	-05	85	11	04	-11	16	-14	01	26	03	09	-03	01	-01	-09	-16	91
(NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOME)	-01	-05	-04	-05	86	10	11	-12	20	-09	-01	25	01	08	-06	-01	-02	-13	-19	93
PHYSICALLY PUNISHES CHILD	02	-04	14	07	10	13	-01	-22	-15	-03	-02	05	-10	-08	10	-11	-09	02	01	16
PERMITS CHILD'S AGGRESSION TOWARDS PARENT	-04	05	-03	07	01	-13	11	-09	-01	08	-01	-12	-06	06	-12	-27	01	-04	19	18
BUYS ON INSTALLMENT PLAN	06	03	-07	09	07	-04	24	18	05	-06	-08	-05	-06	-12	03	10	02	02	-11	29
LIFE INSURANCE POLICY SIZE	-04	01	15	-05	-01	10	10	07	09	24	-01	-02	-08	07	06	-12	12	-02	-12	50
(SPARE TIME ACTIVITIES: RADIO AND TELEVISION)	-13	11	07	-02	06	14	-05	-12	00	10	02	10	-08	-09	02	-12	02	-09	03	11
(SPARE TIME ACTIVITIES: ACTIVE SPORTS AND RECREATION)	08	02	06	02	13	31	-05	-01	05	-15	04	-03	-07	05	10	05	-04	00	03	26
ACTIVITIES IN PAST WEEK: WENT TO A BAR	-07	11	07	17	00	06	14	-01	-17	06	-10	-17	-05	-08	01	01	02	-07	13	30
ACTIVITIES IN PAST WEEK: WORKED ON CAR	04	-06	-05	02	05	05	14	10	-14	-09	-08	-11	-07	06	01	10	09	19	07	29
ACTIVITIES IN PAST WEEK: READ BIBLE	-01	-01	-08	03	-11	05	-02	03	15	14	10	17	-11	03	-08	-04	-09	-08	-08	27
ACTIVITIES IN PAST WEEK: SANG OR PLAYED INSTRUMENT	-07	06	-01	-02	07	-04	08	11	-01	21	-06	02	-09	04	-27	04	-05	04	-04	19
NUMBER OF VISITS WITH FRIENDS	-17	05	13	20	05	02	-03	-15	-17	-01	-06	-11	-08	-08	-08	-15	10	08	05	19
ATTENDANCE AT ORGANIZATION MEETINGS	06	11	07	08	03	36	-03	02	-09	-06	-20	09	-02	-07	-09	-07	04	15	-06	42
NUMBER OF FAVORITE TELEVISION PROGRAMS	-07	02	09	24	05	17	-12	-06	-11	21	14	01	04	-25	04	24	-11	-18	-19	46
TYPE OF FAVORITE TELEVISION PROGRAMS: COMEDY	-15	-14	08	09	07	03	-06	01	01	-01	-03	-13	-02	-04	-03	10	15	04	-20	15
TYPE OF FAVORITE TELEVISION PROGRAMS: CURRENT AFFAIRS AND NEWS	-05	04	-11	-21	-19	-14	07	20	02	08	09	13	03	14	02	-10	-07	-03	17	26
TYPE OF FAVORITE TELEVISION PROGRAMS: MOVIES	10	02	01	-03	07	-02	01	-04	-04	02	-10	07	02	-04	09	16	09	-03	-09	09
TYPE OF FAVORITE TELEVISION PROGRAMS: SPORTS	01	12	06	11	-05	-17	07	03	13	-17	17	-04	04	11	-04	-02	-17	02	25	23
FIRST JOB--DUNCAN	05	17	-05	-05	-09	-06	19	15	-10	21	-04	-02	01	27	02	01	07	-14	-03	49
AGE AT FIRST JOB	18	-12	-09	-14	08	-01	-04	02	05	07	-03	10	-03	22	-01	10	09	03	-10	14
NUMBER OF JOBS HELD	-08	04	08	08	-04	-12	00	05	-07	02	05	14	09	08	-13	-07	-19	-07	54	38
CURRENTLY EMPLOYED FULL TIME	01	17	03	-07	03	02	21	09	-01	-10	00	-11	00	-01	03	05	06	16	14	54
CURRENT OR LAST JOB: SELF-EMPLOYED VS. WORKS FOR SOMEONE ELSE	07	-11	07	-11	08	-19	33	-01	-02	08	19	09	-02	15	-31	11	-08	02	04	34
CURRENT OR LAST JOB: LENGTH OF TIME EMPLOYED	-13	-09	12	00	-13	12	32	12	07	-15	05	01	00	-09	-04	-01	-07	-01	-14	39
CURRENT OR LAST JOB: CHANCES OF ADVANCEMENT	00	-04	12	17	-05	-02	15	-09	-08	25	-07	-12	04	-04	05	-08	-13	02	-11	38
CURRENT OR LAST JOB: EXTENT OF SKILL AND TALENT USED	-03	-08	12	12	04	-06	06	-08	-08	03	02	04	01	02	-10	03	-06	26	-08	26
PREFERRED JOB FOR SELF--DUNCAN	-07	19	-11	-14	-08	-15	05	23	00	07	04	-19	09	19	10	-05	19	09	-21	59
EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION FOR SELF--YEARS	05	30	-02	-11	-04	-15	12	06	-17	-06	10	04	03	04	03	05	09	21	02	36
OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATION FOR SCN--DUNCAN	09	04	-02	-07	-05	09	-03	08	-04	-09	02	04	10	02	22	11	-03	-03	04	13

Table 34 (Continued)

Variable	Factor																			h ²
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	XIX	
EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION FOR SON--YEARS	00	05	05	13	-14	07	10	11	-13	-06	-09	-14	-02	-02	03	01	-01	-05	06	13
EXPECTED CHANGES IN FUTURE INCOME	-05	04	02	03	07	01	-09	-07	-24	12	00	-11	12	09	17	01	11	16	09	43
(BLAU AND DUNCAN'S INTRAGENERATION OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY SCORE)	-10	01	06	-06	25	-14	09	-01	-03	-26	13	04	19	14	06	03	16	27	-25	46
(BLAU AND DUNCAN'S INTERGENERATION OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY SCORE)	-07	15	-03	-05	11	-27	13	15	01	-52	03	-13	24	21	04	05	15	33	-21	70
(INTERGENERATION EDUCATIONAL MOBILITY)	-03	33	16	-04	16	-01	18	11	-15	-69	-05	02	06	08	12	07	-05	04	-31	76
INTRAGENERATION INCOME MOBILITY	-03	21	07	04	07	-08	18	-06	02	-05	01	-13	-05	09	-13	-13	05	21	11	37
(LENSKI'S INDEX OF STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION)	-14	-13	10	14	-14	-08	-25	-06	-08	-25	-04	-04	02	-29	03	-05	04	-11	14	80
(LAUMANN'S INDEX OF ASSOCIATIONAL STATUS CONGRUENCE)	08	07	-01	15	04	06	00	00	-05	-13	00	05	-14	09	-15	-16	-30	-24	37	48
PRESENT VS. FUTURE ORIENTATION	-02	-03	08	06	05	-08	00	00	-06	01	01	08	01	-05	05	-08	-09	-19	-10	13
CHOOSES IMMEDIATE VS. DELAYED GRATIFICATION IN SPENDING WINDFALL	04	-25	-04	08	-03	07	-13	-07	00	15	-05	-11	02	12	-04	00	16	-06	-04	18
VOTING FREQUENCY IN ELECTIONS	-02	18	-08	02	-16	-05	05	20	11	08	14	08	07	03	-03	-01	02	05	00	33
RELIGIOUS INTEREST	18	-11	-12	08	03	-01	-19	-04	09	07	-07	10	03	10	-12	-03	11	-01	-16	34
DATE OF INTERVIEW	-16	-17	-06	-06	-06	34	-08	-02	-05	13	-08	-04	08	15	25	27	12	02	-10	42
LENGTH OF INTERVIEW	-07	-08	05	01	-05	22	00	16	08	00	02	06	-08	09	-05	14	09	-07	-08	21
INTERVIEW REASSIGNED	-08	-03	-06	-04	-14	08	-10	-08	18	03	-10	-13	16	20	05	-11	03	06	02	19
INTERVIEW VALIDATED	-08	12	-01	07	04	-19	01	10	-15	09	-07	04	04	-08	03	-06	-05	-19	07	17
INTERVIEWER: SEX IS MALE	07	13	-24	08	13	-12	04	-07	17	12	09	-04	-12	-08	-16	-12	02	-01	-19	22
INTERVIEWER: AGE	05	-07	-15	-09	-14	10	-04	-03	-08	14	-09	-14	14	32	02	00	07	-04	09	25
INTERVIEWER: EDUCATION	01	08	-18	22	11	02	-04	-03	04	04	00	02	-05	-18	-03	-03	02	-05	-11	16
INTERVIEWER'S RATING OF FRANKNESS	14	42	05	08	01	-01	-13	-06	-11	01	09	12	-03	00	-14	-08	04	12	12	35
MARLOWE-CROWNE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE--REVISED	19	11	-11	-03	09	-19	-08	15	02	-13	11	33	06	-09	-01	06	-13	02	-02	39

Note. These loadings are actually correlations with reference vectors. Variables that are algebraically or experimentally dependent on basic variables are shown in parentheses. Decimal points have been omitted.

Table 35
Percentage of Total Variance Accounted for
by Second-Order Factors

Factor	Variance	
	Whites	Blacks
I	21.9%	19.3%
II	8.9	11.0
III	6.7	6.2
IV	5.1	4.6
V	4.4	3.6
VI	3.4	
Total	50.4%	44.7%

Table 36

Intercorrelations of Obliquely Rotated Second-Order Factors

Factor	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
I		.42	.38	.42	.43	-.03
II	.05		.16	.43	.26	-.03
III	.39	.35		.21	.41	-.13
IV	.42	.29	.51		.34	.22
V	.32	-.01	.20	.32		.05

Note. The intercorrelations of the white factors appear above the diagonal and those for the black factors below it.

Table 37

Obliquely Rotated Loadings of First-Order Factors on Second-Order Factors

First- Order Factor	Whites							Blacks						
	Second-Order Factor							Second-Order Factor						
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	h ²	I	II	III	IV	V	h ²	
I	.29	.00	.21	.25	.21	.01	.71	.05	.24	.06	.31	-.08	.33	
II	.42	-.01	.14	.06	.15	.06	.55	.08	-.35	.45	.01	.19	.47	
III	.14	.24	.42	-.08	.02	.01	.45	-.05	-.07	-.08	.79	-.02	.81	
IV	.03	.14	.47	.02	-.03	-.08	.38	-.17	.35	.21	-.10	.26	.30	
V	.06	.15	-.07	.41	-.01	.23	.49	.67	-.04	-.05	.07	-.20	.56	
VI	-.02	-.09	.07	.60	.03	.00	.51	-.19	.03	.48	.02	-.02	.32	
VII	-.08	.70	.07	-.09	.06	.07	.60	.14	.54	.15	.01	.07	.55	
VIII	-.23	-.20	.40	.24	.09	-.09	.32	.17	.21	.32	.03	.00	.40	
IX	.35	-.10	-.16	.38	.04	-.10	.45	.02	.17	.12	.18	-.17	.19	
X	-.43	-.23	.00	.10	.10	.18	.42	.09	.06	.22	.21	.25	.48	
XI	-.05	.10	.44	.36	-.23	.01	.45	.03	.03	.21	-.08	.16	.10	
XII	-.02	.01	.04	-.04	.71	-.15	.72	-.58	.39	-.01	-.03	-.09	.68	
XIII	-.12	.60	-.06	.05	.08	-.05	.48	-.26	.28	.24	.09	-.13	.32	
XIV	-.05	.18	-.09	.05	.55	.17	.54	-.16	.00	-.05	-.03	.72	.54	
XV	.64	-.23	-.07	.03	-.07	.08	.48	.60	.32	-.12	-.04	.20	.62	
XVI	.01	-.23	.53	-.24	.04	.12	.46	.12	-.56	.08	.06	.10	.39	
XVII	-.02	.08	.00	.04	.00	-.83	.77	.06	.03	.56	-.05	-.21	.48	
XVIII	-.03	.15	-.05	.17	-.05	.42	.32	.18	.56	-.06	.10	.08	.48	
XIX								.58	.00	.10	-.12	-.38	.47	

Note. These loadings are actually correlations with reference vectors.

Table 38

Obliquely Rotated Loadings of Second-Order Factors on Third-Order Factors

Second- Order Factor	Whites			Blacks		
	<u>Third-Order Factor</u>			<u>Third-Order Factor</u>		
	I	II	h^2	I	II	h^2
I	.74	-.06	.55	.63	-.02	.42
II	.52	.05	.28	-.09	.78	.62
III	.51	-.22	.30	.46	.38	.48
IV	.59	.33	.49	.59	.27	.55
V	.60	-.01	.36	.48	-.10	.23
VI	-.05	.70	.49			

Note. These loadings are actually correlations with reference vectors.

Table 39

Means and Standard Deviations for Social Status Variables (T Score Form) and Factor Score in Carlson Clusters

Cluster	N	Interviewer's Rating of Social Class		Own Occupation-- Duncan		Own Education-- years		Friend's Occupation-- Duncan		Interviewer's Rating of Intelligence		Interviewer's Rating of Grammar		Factor Score	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
1	2	46.00	.00	49.00	1.41	58.00	.00	39.50	.71	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	51.00	2.83
2	3	46.00	.00	49.33	1.15	52.00	.00	50.33	2.52	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	49.33	.58
3	4	46.00	.00	35.25	.96	52.00	.00	38.00	3.16	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	44.50	3.51
4	2	58.00	.00	59.50	3.54	61.00	.00	54.00	.00	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	61.00	.00
5	2	22.00	.00	38.00	.00	44.50	2.12	41.50	3.54	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	34.50	2.12
6	2	34.00	.00	37.50	3.54	37.50	2.12	55.00	1.41	34.00	.00	24.00	.00	35.50	2.12
7	4	34.00	.00	39.75	.50	49.75	2.87	39.50	3.32	34.00	.00	41.00	.00	34.75	1.50
8	4	58.00	.00	57.50	1.91	40.75	3.50	58.00	3.61	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	54.75	3.77
9	6	58.00	.00	55.00	1.10	57.50	2.26	54.17	4.49	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	56.17	1.47
10	4	58.00	.00	59.33	1.15	55.00	4.24	66.00	2.83	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	61.75	3.40
11	4	46.00	.00	53.00	5.20	58.00	2.45	57.25	3.10	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	54.00	.82
12	2	58.00	.00	69.50	3.54	74.00	.00	69.00	4.24	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	68.50	2.12
13	2	46.00	.00	39.50	2.12	42.50	4.95	46.50	3.54	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	45.50	.71
14	2	34.00	.00	52.00	.00	49.00	4.24	45.50	4.95	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	42.00	4.24
15	2	58.00	.00	52.00	2.83	61.50	4.95	62.50	3.54	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	54.50	2.12

Table 39 (Continued)

Cluster	N	Interviewer's Rating of Social Class		Own Occupation-- Duncan		Own Education-- years		Friend's Occupation-- Duncan		Interviewer's Rating of Intelligence		Interviewer's Rating of Grammar		Factor Score	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
16	3	46.00	.00	36.50	3.54	49.00	3.00	53.67	5.69	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	47.00	3.61
17	5	46.00	.00	61.67	6.51	52.00	4.24	56.25	5.19	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	55.80	4.60
18	6	46.00	.00	49.75	8.66	46.50	3.51	39.17	3.31	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	43.67	2.34
19	2	46.00	.00	47.50	3.54	36.00	4.24	52.50	4.95	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	48.50	2.12
20	13	58.00	.00	51.67	6.95	52.00	.00	52.10	6.12	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	54.85	3.16
21	13	58.00	.00	54.00	6.38	52.00	.00	55.33	7.98	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	58.38	3.64
22	4	55.00	6.00	54.25	4.57	50.50	3.00	56.50	3.11	64.00	.00	41.00	.00	57.25	3.77
23	5	58.00	.00	40.60	2.51	46.40	5.68	56.80	6.57	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	50.00	4.47
24	11	63.70	9.18	61.70	3.59	65.55	1.21	59.91	2.07	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	66.55	4.23
25	10	34.00	.00	45.22	8.80	40.20	5.87	48.14	3.39	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	40.00	1.56
26	6	46.00	.00	43.75	10.24	45.00	1.55	44.20	9.47	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	46.67	4.72
27	13	46.00	.00	45.64	6.38	44.17	6.97	48.50	6.45	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	44.54	4.67
28	6	58.00	.00	49.00	8.07	48.20	5.76	46.50	6.76	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	50.00	3.22
29	9	58.00	.00	61.86	7.58	65.22	2.05	59.88	9.49	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	64.33	2.92
30	2	40.00	8.49	44.50	6.36	21.00	.00	36.00	.00	34.00	.00	41.00	.00	30.50	.71
31	2	46.00	.00	63.00	5.66	58.50	9.19	37.00	1.41	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	50.50	2.12
32	6	44.00	4.90	40.50	3.99	46.83	5.19	39.00	3.85	40.00	8.22	24.00	.00	39.33	4.63

Table 39 (Continued)

Cluster	N	Interviewer's Rating of Social Class		Own Occupation-- Duncan		Own Education-- years		Friend's Occupation-- Duncan		Interviewer's Rating of Intelligence		Interviewer's Rating of Grammar		Factor Score	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
33	12	46.00	.00	44.60	7.17	43.17	7.48	48.44	8.22	34.00	.00	41.00	.00	41.92	3.26
34	12	46.00	.00	45.73	8.16	51.50	1.73	48.22	11.69	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	48.83	3.93
35	2	77.00	.00	58.00	4.24	52.00	.00	62.50	3.54	56.50	10.61	57.00	.00	63.00	4.24
36	4	31.00	6.00	35.75	1.71	24.50	7.14	36.25	2.50	37.75	7.50	24.00	.00	26.00	4.55
37	10	42.00	8.49	43.14	5.73	48.44	6.50	36.50	6.16	37.33	10.00	48.11	8.43	41.80	7.35

Note. The N used in computing the statistics for each variable in a cluster may differ because of missing data.

Table 40

Analysis of Variance of Social Status Variables and Factor Score
for Carlson and Ward Clusters

Variable and Source	Carlson Clusters			Ward Clusters		
	df	MS	F	df	MS	F
Interviewer's rating of social class						
Clusters	36	483.96	45.00	46	432.89	90.71
Within (error)	162	10.75		172	4.77	
Own occupation--Duncan						
Clusters	36	294.53	7.94	46	346.98	19.48
Within (error)	136	37.08		146	17.81	
Own education--years						
Clusters	36	427.19	23.27	46	395.27	28.89
Within (error)	161	18.36		171	13.68	
Friend's occupation--Duncan						
Clusters	36	331.96	8.56	46	375.19	23.24
Within (error)	142	38.76		151	16.14	
Interviewer's rating of intelligence						
Clusters	36	489.74	58.35	46	457.37	83.43
Within (error)	161	8.39		171	5.48	
Interviewer's rating of grammar						
Clusters	36	524.33	150.23	46	430.84	29.15
Within (error)	163	3.49		173	1.48	
Factor score						
Clusters	36	493.29	33.97	46	427.95	49.73
Within (error)	164	14.52		174	8.60	

Note. All of the F ratios are significant at the .01 level.

Table 41
Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Social Status Variables
for Carlson and Ward Clusters

lambda	N	p	k	Rao Approximation		
				df ₁	df ₂	F
Carlson Clusters						
.00	201	6	37	216	945	21.39**
Ward Clusters						
.00	221	6	47	276	1016	38.28**

**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 42

Means for Social Status Variables (Raw Score Form) and Factor Score
and Their Substantive Meaning in Large Carlson Clusters

Cluster and Variable	Mean	Substantive Meaning
Cluster 25 (N=10)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	20.00	Upper lower class
Own occupation--Duncan	33.11	Craftsman, foreman, and kindred worker
Own education--years	8.30	Grade school graduate
Friend's occupation--Duncan	41.43	Clerical and kindred worker
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	3.00	Average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	2.00	Makes a few mistakes in grammar
Factor score	40.00	--
Cluster 37 (N=10)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	26.67	Lower middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	28.43	Craftsman, foreman, and kindred worker
Own education--years	10.89	Three years of high school
Friend's occupation--Duncan	14.25	Farmer and farm manager
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	2.22	Slow
Interviewer's rating of grammar	2.44	Makes a few mistakes in grammar
Factor score	41.80	--

Table 42 (Continued)

Cluster and Variable	Mean	Substantive Meaning
Cluster 33 (N=12)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	30.00	Lower middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	31.70	Craftsman, foreman, and kindred worker
Own education--years	9.25	One year of high school
Friend's occupation--Duncan	42.33	Clerical and kindred worker
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	2.00	Slow
Interviewer's rating of grammar	2.00	Makes a few mistakes in grammar
Factor score	41.92	--
Cluster 27 (N=13)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	30.00	Lower middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	34.27	Craftsman, foreman, and kindred worker
Own education--years	9.58	Two years of high school
Friend's occupation--Duncan	42.42	Clerical and kindred worker
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	3.00	Average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	2.00	Makes a few mistakes in grammar
Factor score	44.54	--
Cluster 34 (N=12)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	30.00	Lower middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	34.55	Craftsman, foreman, and kindred worker
Own education--years	11.83	High school graduate
Friend's occupation--Duncan	41.89	Clerical and kindred worker
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	3.00	Average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	3.00	Speaks correctly
Factor score	48.83	--

Table 42 (Continued)

Cluster and Variable	Mean	Substantive Meaning
Cluster 20 (N=13)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	40.00	Upper middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	48.25	Salesworker
Own education--years	12.00	High school graduate
Friend's occupation--Duncan	51.00	Sales worker
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	3.00	Average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	3.00	Speaks correctly
Factor score	54.85	--
Cluster 21 (N=13)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	40.00	Upper middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	53.67	Manager, official, and proprietor, except farm
Own education--years	12.00	High school graduate
Friend's occupation--Duncan	57.83	Manager, official, and proprietor, except farm
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	4.00	Above average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	3.00	Speaks correctly
Factor score	58.38	--
Cluster 29 (N=9)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	40.00	Upper middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	72.57	Professional, technical, and kindred worker
Own education--years	16.11	College graduate
Friend's occupation--Duncan	68.50	Professional, technical, and kindred worker
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	4.00	Above average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	3.00	Speaks correctly
Factor score	64.33	--

Table 42 (Continued)

Cluster and Variable	Mean	Substantive Meaning
Cluster 24 (N=11)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	44.50	Upper middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	71.30	Professional, technical, and kindred worker
Own education--years	16.18	College graduate
Friend's occupation--Duncan	69.18	Professional, technical, and kindred worker
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	4.00	Above average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	3.00	Speaks correctly
Factor score	66.55	--

Table 43

Means and Standard Deviations for Social Status Variables (T Score Form) and Factor Score in Ward Clusters

Cluster	N	<u>Interviewer's Rating of Social Class</u>		<u>Own Occupation-- Duncan</u>		<u>Own Education-- years</u>		<u>Friend's Occupation-- Duncan</u>		<u>Interviewer's Rating of Intelligence</u>		<u>Interviewer's Rating of Grammar</u>		<u>Factor Score</u>	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
1	9	58.00	.00	56.29	2.81	52.33	2.35	51.00	6.16	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	58.22	2.95
2	13	58.00	.00	56.92	2.50	53.85	3.98	54.50	3.09	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	56.69	1.89
3	5	46.00	.00	40.75	3.59	42.60	3.51	38.60	3.21	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	45.40	2.30
4	9	58.00	.00	58.00	5.10	53.33	3.04	63.89	3.33	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	61.33	3.20
5	7	46.00	.00	51.60	2.97	51.00	2.45	53.43	3.31	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	48.57	3.21
6	4	46.00	.00	53.67	3.51	52.75	1.50	52.67	3.21	34.00	.00	41.00	.00	45.00	3.16
7	11	46.00	.00	39.09	3.51	51.45	1.81	38.33	2.06	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	45.64	2.69
8	11	58.00	.00	60.91	3.36	64.82	2.23	59.36	3.23	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	64.09	2.39
9	5	38.80	6.57	38.60	4.72	48.40	3.91	49.00	2.45	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	42.60	2.41
10	8	58.00	.00	44.57	4.58	52.00	.00	54.67	6.09	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	53.25	1.83
11	9	46.00	.00	48.57	1.99	54.00	3.35	55.62	5.83	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	51.67	2.74
12	5	58.00	.00	51.40	6.19	47.25	6.18	49.67	2.89	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	50.40	3.44
13	4	34.00	.00	39.00	1.41	40.33	5.13	39.00	6.24	34.00	.00	41.00	.00	34.00	2.58
14	5	46.00	.00	43.25	5.56	42.00	5.87	52.25	3.77	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	47.40	3.85
15	4	43.00	6.00	40.00	4.16	44.25	4.27	40.50	3.11	34.00	.00	24.00	.00	37.50	4.04

Table 43 (Continued)

Cluster	N	Interviewer's Rating of Social Class		Own Occupation-- Duncan		Own Education-- years		Friend's Occupation-- Duncan		Interviewer's Rating of Intelligence		Interviewer's Rating of Grammar		Factor Score	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
16	7	38.00	6.20	40.00	.58	51.14	1.46	35.86	2.61	34.00	.00	41.00	.00	38.00	3.87
17	4	46.00	.00	41.75	4.27	39.00	.00	38.67	4.73	34.00	.00	41.00	.00	40.00	2.58
18	4	55.00	6.00	54.25	4.57	50.50	3.00	56.50	3.11	64.00	.00	41.00	.00	57.25	3.77
19	6	58.00	.00	67.20	2.95	68.50	4.42	68.17	2.99	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	66.83	1.72
20	2	77.00	.00	58.00	4.24	52.00	.00	62.50	3.54	56.50	10.61	57.00	.00	63.00	4.24
21	2	46.00	.00	67.00	.00	56.50	6.36	35.00	1.41	56.50	10.61	57.00	.00	52.00	4.24
22	3	58.00	.00	58.00	2.00	39.00	.00	59.50	3.54	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	55.00	4.58
23	5	46.00	.00	61.67	6.51	52.00	4.24	56.25	5.19	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	55.80	4.60
24	3	46.00	.00	51.00	4.24	51.00	1.73	43.00	9.90	34.00	.00	57.00	.00	45.33	3.21
25	4	46.00	.00	42.00	3.61	38.25	1.50	50.67	4.73	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	42.00	4.00
26	4	46.00	.00	39.33	3.21	37.75	4.27	54.00	4.58	34.00	.00	41.00	.00	40.75	1.71
27	4	58.00	.00	56.33	9.45	64.00	2.00	49.00	1.00	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	61.75	2.22
28	4	34.00	.00	52.33	3.51	42.50	8.27	44.75	5.06	45.25	7.50	57.00	.00	40.75	3.10
29	5	46.00	.00	62.00	5.39	48.80	7.66	57.60	2.30	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	53.60	1.14
30	2	46.00	.00	41.50	4.95	52.00	.00	36.00	4.24	49.00	.00	24.00	.00	43.00	4.24
31	4	58.00	.00	39.50	.58	41.00	4.40	49.75	8.54	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	47.25	4.35
32	2	58.00	.00	41.00	.00	53.50	2.12	39.50	9.19	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	54.50	2.12

Table 43 (Continued)

Cluster	N	Interviewer's Rating of Social Class		Own Occupation-- Duncan		Own Education-- years		Friend's Occupation-- Duncan		Interviewer's Rating of Intelligence		Interviewer's Rating of Grammar		Factor Score	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
33	5	34.00	.00	53.25	4.65	38.40	1.34	46.33	3.06	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	39.40	1.34
34	3	34.00	.00	36.33	1.53	28.00	1.73	37.33	1.53	39.00	8.66	24.00	.00	28.00	2.65
35	2	58.00	.00	58.50	4.95	42.50	4.95	56.00	.00	34.00	.00	49.00	11.31	51.50	3.54
36	3	46.00	.00	52.33	5.86	60.33	4.04	39.00	1.00	49.00	.00	57.00	.00	51.33	2.08
37	4	58.00	.00	50.75	4.27	57.50	5.57	62.25	2.63	45.25	7.50	57.00	.00	55.25	2.22
38	2	34.00	.00	37.50	3.54	37.50	2.12	55.00	1.41	34.00	.00	24.00	.00	35.50	2.12
39	5	77.00	.00	65.00	6.38	67.40	3.91	61.20	5.02	64.00	.00	57.00	.00	71.00	5.70
40	4	46.00	.00	54.00	2.00	47.50	3.87	40.75	2.75	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	44.75	2.06
41	2	58.00	.00	48.50	14.85	36.00	.00	37.00	.00	34.00	.00	41.00	.00	46.00	.00
42	2	34.00	.00	37.00	4.24	34.50	6.36	51.50	3.54	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	40.00	2.83
43	6	46.00	.00	40.80	4.92	39.83	4.40	37.17	2.04	49.00	.00	41.00	.00	40.83	1.47
44	3	26.00	6.93	38.50	.71	42.67	3.51	40.00	3.61	56.50	10.61	41.00	.00	36.00	3.00
45	2	58.00	.00	42.50	7.78	52.00	.00	37.00	.00	49.00	.00	49.00	11.31	48.50	.71
46	2	52.00	8.49	69.50	2.12	67.50	9.19	42.00	.00	41.50	10.61	41.00	.00	50.50	.71
47	2	40.00	8.49	44.50	6.36	21.00	.00	36.00	.00	34.00	.00	41.00	.00	30.50	.71

Note. The N used in computing the statistics for each variable in a cluster may differ because of missing data.

Table 44

Means for Social Status Variables (Raw Score Form) and Factor Score
and Their Substantive Meaning in Large Ward Clusters

Cluster and Variable	Mean	Substantive Meaning
Cluster 7 (N=11)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	29.83	Lower middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	18.77	Operative and kindred worker
Own education--years	11.82	High school graduate
Friend's occupation--Duncan	18.43	Operative and kindred worker
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	3.00	Average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	2.97	Speaks correctly
Factor score	45.64	--
Cluster 11 (N=9)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	29.83	Lower middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	40.88	Clerical and kindred worker
Own education--years	12.63	One year of college
Friend's occupation--Duncan	58.82	Manager, official, and proprietor, except farm
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	3.00	Average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	2.97	Speaks correctly
Factor score	51.67	--

Table 44 (Continued)

Cluster and Variable	Mean	Substantive Meaning
Cluster 2 (N=13)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	39.63	Upper middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	60.36	Manager, official, and proprietor, except farm
Own education--years	12.58	One year of college
Friend's occupation--Duncan	56.20	Manager, official, and proprietor, except farm
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	3.00	Average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	2.97	Speaks correctly
Factor score	56.69	--
Cluster 1 (N=9)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	39.63	Upper middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	58.88	Manager, official, and proprietor, except farm
Own education--years	12.10	High school graduate
Friend's occupation--Duncan	48.02	Sales worker
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	4.02	Above average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	2.97	Speaks correctly
Factor score	58.22	--
Cluster 4 (N= 9)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	39.63	Upper middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	62.88	Manager, official, and proprietor, except farm
Own education--years	12.42	High school graduate
Friend's occupation--Duncan	78.13	Professional, technical, and kindred worker
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	4.02	Above average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	2.97	Speaks correctly
Factor score	61.33	--

Table 44 (Continued)

Cluster and Variable	Mean	Substantive Meaning
Cluster 6 (N=4)		
Interviewer's rating of social class	39.63	Upper middle class
Own occupation--Duncan	69.66	Professional, technical, and kindred worker
Own education--years	16.09	College graduate
Friend's occupation--Duncan	67.56	Professional, technical, and kindred worker
Interviewer's rating of intelligence	4.02	Above average intelligence
Interviewer's rating of grammar	2.97	Speaks correctly
Factor score	64.09	--

Table 45

Correspondence in Score Profiles and Respondent Composition
of Matching Carlson and Ward Clusters

Clusters		D ² for Mean Profiles	Percentage of Common Respondents	kappa
Carlson	Ward			
1	36	17	99.6	.80**
2	11	33	97.3	.49**
3	7	15	96.9	.52**
4	27	44	97.3	-.01
5	44	78	99.6	.80**
6	38	0	100.0	1.00**
7	16	31	97.8	.54**
8	22	5	99.6	.86**
9	2	17	96.0	.51**
10	4	9	97.8	.61**
12	19	36	98.2	.49**
13	14	47	97.8	.28**
14	28	57	99.1	.66**
15	37	32	99.1	.66**
16	9	78	98.2	.49**
17	23	0	100.0	1.00**
18	40	22	99.1	.80**
21	1	24	96.4	.62**
22	18	0	100.0	1.00**
23	10	52	96.0	.29**
25	33	71	97.8	.66**
26	3	46	97.8	.53**
27	25	53	96.0	.46**
28	12	17	99.6	.91**
29	8	1	92.0	.06
30	47	0	100.0	1.00**
31	21	80	99.1	.50**
32	15	46	99.1	.80**
33	26	88	96.4	.49**
35	20	0	100.0	1.00**
36	34	24	99.6	.86**

**Significant at .01 level (one-tailed)

Table 46

Summary of Loadings of Standard Stratification Indexes on Matching First-Order Factors

Stratification Index	White Factor					Black Factor					
	Social Status	Residence	Organization Activity	Political Activity and Efficacy	Main Support's Social Status	Social Status	Residence	Organization Activity	Political Activity and Efficacy	Main Support's Social Status	
	I	II	IV	VIII	XII	II	I	III	VI	VIII	X
Own occupation--Duncan	(.44)					()					
Own education--years	(.35)					(.43)					
Own income--in 1000's											
Centers' Class Identification measure	()?					()?					
Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position	(.41)					()					
Warner et al.'s Index of Status Characteristics	()					()	.64				
Chapin's Social Status Scale--original weights	()? (.34)					()? ()			.34		

Note. Parentheses indicate an instance in which a stratification index is clearly relevant to a factor; parentheses with a question mark indicate a case where an index is potentially relevant.

Table 47

Summary of Loadings of Standard Stratification Indexes on Other White First-Order Factors

Stratification Index	Factor												
	Intactness of Family	Age	Occupational Success	Household Expenses	Self-Employed	Majority Group Membership	Political Efficacy	Uninterpretable	Uninterpretable	Alienation	Uninterpretable	Uninterpretable	Uninterpretable
	III	V	VI	VII	IX	X	XI	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII
Own occupation—Duncan													
Own education—years													
Own income—in 1000's	.32		()?										
Centers' Class Identification measure													
Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position													
Warner et al.'s Index of Status Characteristics													
Chapin's Social Status Scale—original weights	-.39			-.49		-.43				-.46	.34		

Note. There is no instance in this table where a stratification index is clearly relevant to a factor; parentheses with a question mark indicate a case where an index is potentially relevant.

Table 48

Summary of Loadings of Standard Stratification Indexes on Other Black First-Order Factors

Stratification Index	Factor												
	Method Variance	Household Size	Nature of Income	Amount of Housing	Power--Political and Occupational	Conservative Ideology	Leadership	Occupational Orientation	Class Consciousness	Uninterpretable	Uninterpretable	Uninterpretable	Uninterpretable
	IV	V	VII	IX	XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	XIX
Own occupation--Duncan													
Own education--years													
Own income--in 1000's			(.33)?										
Centers' Class Identification measure									()				
Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position								.39					-.32
Warner et al.'s Index of Status Characteristics								.45					
Chapin's Social Status scale--original weights													

Note. Parentheses indicate an instance in which a stratification index is clearly relevant to a factor; parentheses with a question mark indicate a case where an index is potentially relevant.

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Mean factor scores for Carlson and Ward clusters.

Fig. 2. Error function in Ward cluster analysis.



